

A standard 1D barcode with vertical black bars of varying widths on a white background. Above the barcode, the text "LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT" is partially visible. Below the barcode, the number "0005" is printed.

3 2354 00409 780 7

23/10/02 AVR 5 2005		
GAYLORD		PRINTED IN U.S.A.

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

ect
nd

ence

M 3 Al
ect

and

✓
103

H7

1922

M3

A1

103
H7.
1922
M3
A1

OFFICIAL REPORT OF EVIDENCE

TAKEN BY THE

MARINE AND FISHERIES COMMITTEE

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS, CANADA

RESPECTING

FISHERIES OF BRITISH COLUMBIA



OTTAWA
F. A. ACLAND
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1922

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

OTTAWA, March 23, 1922.

Resolved.—That the following members do compose the Select Standing Committee on Marine and Fisheries:—

Messieurs

Bancroft,	Hughes,	Munro,
Cardin,	Kennedy, (<i>Port Arthur and</i>	Pelletier,
Chisholm,	<i>Kenora</i>),	Putnam,
Delisle,	Kyte,	Ross (<i>Simcoe</i>),
Dickie,	Lapointe,	Savard,
Duff,	Léger,	Spencer,
Elliott (<i>Waterloo</i>),	LeSueur,	Stansell,
Fournier,	MacLaren,	Stevens,
Gauvreau,	MacLean (<i>Prince</i>),	Stewart (<i>Humboldt</i>),
Grimmer,	Stork,	Turgeon, and
Hatfield,	McQuarrie,	Ward.—36.
Hoey,	Martell,	
Neill,	Morriessy,	

And that a quorum of the said Committee do consist of Ten Members.

Attest

W. B. NORTHRUP,
Clerk of the House.

Ordered.—That the Select Standing Committee on Marine and Fisheries be empowered to examine and inquire into all such matters and things as may be referred to them by the House; and to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereon, with power to send for persons, papers and records.

Attest

W. B. NORTHRUP,
Clerk of the House.

MONDAY, April 10, 1922.

Ordered.—That the following Resolution be referred to the said Committee:—

Resolved.—That, in the opinion of this House, it is advisable that the Standing Committee on Marine and Fisheries be and the said Standing Committee is hereby authorized and empowered to investigate and consider fisheries conditions in British Columbia, and more particularly, but not so as to restrict the generality of the foregoing, the depletion of the salmon fisheries of the Fraser River District, and to make suggestions for the restoration and conservation of the same; also to investigate and consider fish hatcheries, including the proper system to be adopted, their value as a means of propagation, the methods of operation and the results obtained therefrom; with power as to all the hereinbefore mentioned matters to call for persons, papers and records, to examine witnesses under oath and to report from time to time.

Attest

W. B. NORTHRUP,
Clerk of the House.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE

Mr. Duff, from the Select Standing Committee on Marine and Fisheries, presented the First Report of the said Committee, which is as follows:—

The Standing Committee on Marine and Fisheries to which was referred the resolution of the House of Commons passed April 10th, 1922, reading as follows:—

Resolved—“That, in the opinion of this House, it is advisable that the Standing Committee on Marine and Fisheries be and the said Standing Committee is hereby authorized and empowered to investigate and consider fisheries conditions in British Columbia, and more particularly, but not so as to restrict the generality of the foregoing, the depletion of the salmon fisheries of the Fraser River District, and to make suggestions for the restoration and conservation of the same; also to investigate and consider fish hatcheries, including the proper system to be adopted, their value as a means of propagation, the methods of operation and the results obtained therefrom; with power as to all the hereinbefore mentioned matters to call for persons, papers and records, to examine witnesses under oath and to report from time to time,” beg to submit the following as their First Report:—

Your Committee has held a number of sittings; has heard certain witnesses and considered certain reports, communications and other documents, but has not been able to make a complete inquiry into the matters submitted to it. However, the Members of the Committee are unanimously agreed that the seriousness of Fishery conditions at the Pacific coast warrants full and complete investigation.

In order to enable the Committee to make an intelligent and comprehensive report, it is considered absolutely necessary that evidence should be taken in British Columbia where it will be possible to call witnesses representatives of all classes engaged in the industry. The only alternative would be to bring a large number of witnesses from the British Columbia coast to Ottawa, which would entail very great expense.

Realizing that the functions of this Committee will cease on prorogation, your Committee recommends that a commission composed of such members of this Committee as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries may deem advisable, be appointed, pursuant to the provisions of the Inquiries Act, Chapter 104 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, to proceed to British Columbia and to hold sittings at such places and at such times as the Commission may consider expedient, for the purpose of obtaining such further information as may be available. And further, that such Commission be given the usual powers to call witnesses and to examine the same under oath, inspect premises and generally to make full inquiry into all matters and things covered by the resolution and to report.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

COMMITTEE ROOM 429,
HOUSE OF COMMONS,
FRIDAY, April 21, 1922.

The Select Standing Committee on Marine and Fisheries met at 11.00 o'clock, a.m., the Chairman, Mr. Duff, presiding.

The CHAIRMAN: Will the Committee come to order, please. This as you know is a meeting of the Committee on Marine and Fisheries. We intended to have a regular meetings next Wednesday, but due to the fact that Mr. Lord, who is interested in the British Columbia Fisheries, is here from that Province, and he was in to see me yesterday, and at his solicitation, and at the solicitation of some of the members of the Committee I decided to have a special committee to-day. First, I might ask the Clerk to read the order of reference from the House, so we can proceed regularly.

The CLERK: (Reading.) "That the Select Standing Committee on Marine and Fisheries be empowered to examine and enquire into all such matters and things that may be referred to them by the House: and to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereon, with power to send for persons, papers and records.

"That the name of Mr. Stork be substituted for that of Mr. McKenzie on the said Committee.

"Monday, April 10th, 1922.

"That the following resolutions be referred to the said Committee.

"Resolved that, in the opinion of this House, it is advisable that the standing Committee on Marine and Fisheries, be and the said Standing Committee is hereby authorized and empowered to investigate and consider fisheries conditions in British Columbia, and more particularly, but not so as to restrict the generality of the foregoing, the depletion of the Salmon Fisheries of the Fraser River district, and to make suggestions for the restoration and conservation of same; also to investigate and consider fish hatcheries, including the proper system to be adopted, their value as a means of propagation, the methods of operation and the results obtained therefrom; with power as to all the herein before mentioned matters to call for persons, papers and records, to examine witnesses under oath and to report from time to time.

"Tuesday, April 11, 1922.

"That the name of Mr. Neill be substituted for that of Mr. Hubbs on the said Committee."

The CHAIRMAN: That is the reference, gentlemen, of this matter to a Committee. Now, Mr. Lord is not here at the moment and it might be as well while we are waiting for him that Mr. McQuarrie, who moved the resolution, should perhaps give us some idea of what he would like the Committee to investigate.

Mr. MCQUARRIE: I am very glad this Committee has been authorized to investigate conditions in connection with Fisheries in British Columbia. I had the honour of being a member of this Committee during the last Parliament, but I found the Committee had almost not been doing any work at all, excepting one or two instances

in connection with the labelling of lobsters. I think there were a couple of bills in connection with the labelling of lobsters. In British Columbia at the present time it seems to me the situation is very serious. I discussed the matter in the House, more particularly in connection with the Fraser River, but there are other questions as well which should be considered, and of course must be taken up. We have in British Columbia three districts, I think the three large districts, districts Nos. 1, 2, and 3. Now, Fraser River is in No. 1 district. Now, Mr. Stork and Mr. Dickie would be more particularly interested in the other districts. There are questions there which should be taken into consideration. There is, for instance, in district No. 2 the question of whether the gas boats should be allowed on the Skeena River or not. Then there is the matter of licenses between the different districts. At the present time I understand that the fisherman, if he desires to fish in two of the districts, must take out a license for the two districts; if he wishes to fish in three districts, he must take out three licenses. There has been a strong demand that a man with one license should be entitled to fish in other districts if he desires to do so. I know in my district, a great many of our fishermen do go up to the Northern waters to fish and although I am interested in the Fraser River I am also interested in the upper waters as well, because as I say, a great many of my constituents fish in those districts. Then there is the matter of the treatment of returned men, perhaps the treatment of white men by the Cannerymen and the alleged discrimination that is taking place there or that exists in favour of the Japanese. I have been told that the Cannerymen—I am not making any definite charges as to any of the Canneries because there are men who have no doubt different ideas, and who are playing the game with the white men—but as a general thing I am told the Cannerymen are not doing the right thing as far as the white men are concerned, but instead of that they are giving preference to the Japanese. That does not refer particularly to the Fraser River district, but to the Northern districts and I am told returned men have no chance at all with the Cannerymen, that they cannot make a living in the North, that they cannot get an opportunity to fish, that they are not given any encouragement; on the other hand, he is discouraged from taking part in fishing in the Northern waters. If that is so I think it is a matter that should be taken up by this Committee. It may be that we cannot pass any legislation on it but it has been suggested to me that representation should be made to the Cannerymen that they should give the white men and more particularly the returned soldier a square deal. There are also other matters. There is of course the question of the number of Orientals employed in the fisheries of British Columbia and that applies not only to the Fraser River district, but to other districts as well. There are I think it is admitted by every one except possibly the Cannerymen—there are too many Japanese employed in the Fisheries of British Columbia, altogether too many, and that applies as I said before to all the districts. They have simply come in there and have taken possession of our fisheries, and I am told that in some districts the Japanese consider that they really have a monopoly and that they have the right, the exclusive right to fish in those particular areas, and that if a white man comes in there it is made so uncomfortable for him that he has to get out. If that is true and it has come to that pass that the white man has to keep out of certain areas because the Japanese say so, this country is fast developing into something that we would not like to have. Those are matters that have to be taken up now. What I would suggest is that the Committee should consider in carrying on this investigation whether we should deal exclusively with one particular subject to start with, that is, say the Fraser River, or whether we should in our investigations cover the whole subject of the fisheries situation in British Columbia. We have in this City certain officials of the Fisheries Department, who have quite an extensive knowledge of Fisheries conditions in British Columbia. Some of them have spent a good deal of time out on the Pacific Coast. I can refer particularly to Mr. Found,

who was out there this last season for a couple of months, studying conditions right there on the ground. My suggestion to the Committee would be that we should, first of all, call before us the proper officials of the department in Ottawa, and that we should get them to explain what has been done and what is being done to improve conditions in British Columbia. Of course, they, no doubt, have certain reports, a great many reports on conditions, not only from the officials of the Department of the Dominion, but also from the local departments of the British Columbia Government and no doubt other reports from officers or officials of the State of Washington, for instance, American authorities, who also have been studying this question for a long time. I would suggest we should have those officials before us, possibly we might start with Mr. Found, unless Mr. Johnston could suggest to us someone else with whom we could start, and we could get his reports and we could go into the matter as well as we could with him. Then we can examine other officials of the department in Ottawa later on; possibly we will find it necessary to bring witnesses from British Columbia and if we do that of course we would like to hear all sides of the question. There are no doubt different opinions in regard to various matters. We will want to have the Canning men here, representatives of the canning men, representatives of the fishing men, representatives of the business interests, and I think our time will be very well spent in considering conditions in British Columbia. It would be a good thing if this fisheries Committee does real work. I think it should be an important Committee and I think there is a lot of work for us to do. In the House some of the honourable gentlemen said my resolution should have been wider in its scope, that we should have taken in conditions on the Atlantic. In limiting my resolution to the Pacific Coast I did not do so with any spirit of selfishness in any sense of the word, but I knew conditions were unsatisfactory out in British Columbia, and I think the hon. gentlemen will remember that I stated that if there were similar conditions on the Atlantic or elsewhere I would be very glad to co-operate with the members from those districts, in considering those matters. Now, I would submit, Mr. Chairman, that if there is any desire of bringing in Atlantic matters before this Committee, it is very easy for any member to put a resolution referring any particular matter to this Committee which he thinks it should take up. I am sure it would be right and proper that this Committee should also deal with conditions on the Atlantic as well as on the Pacific. It seems to me we have a big work to do, our time can be very well spent if we can encourage the fisheries resources or increase the fisheries resources of the Dominion of Canada. It will mean a big thing to the Country at large, and I think we can increase them.

Now, as to the method of procedure, it will be for the Committee to say, but I would think that in hearing the witnesses, the officials of the department, we might very well start say with the Fraser River, and then take up other matters which pertain to other districts. When we have the official here we can cover the whole ground, as it were, and not simply deal with one district, and then we might have him back again for another district and so on. I think we can have a very interesting time. I thank you, gentlemen, for listening to these remarks.

Mr. DICKIE: This meeting is called, I believe, primarily for the purpose of hearing Mr. Lord from British Columbia. It has been called through the great kindness of Mr. Duff because of the fact that Mr. Lord has only a few days to remain here, and we thought it would be an advantage to hear his ideas respecting the fisheries question. I have known Mr. Lord a great many years. He has conducted operations in all the three districts of British Columbia. He is a man who is highly respected by fishermen and cannerymen and it would seem to me, with all respect to my good friend Mr. McQuarrie, that possibly we might devote this morning to hearing Mr. Lord's views on the subject and probably we can develop a programme that will be to the best advantage of all concerned.

The CHAIRMAN: I think Mr. McQuarrie will agree to that. It is necessary to get the officials of the department to give us all the information they have in their possession, but as Mr. Lord is here on his own expense, and he has signified his intention to give us any information he may have, I think we might hear Mr. Lord at once. So if that is satisfactory, will Mr. Lord please take the chair.

Mr. WILLIAM R. LORD, Called, sworn and examined.

Mr. DICKIE: Mr. Lord has prepared a lucid statement and I thought that would give the views that Mr. Lord has to expose, and we can probably branch out into further issues later on.

WITNESS: This only deals with one particular thing in regard to fisheries, as to the embargo. That could probably be read out.

Mr. LORD presented the following statement to the Committee.

In March of this year the Cannery Association sent a deputation to Ottawa to point out to the Minister of Fisheries the way the cannerymen in British Columbia, who have large investments, are handicapped by the Americans taking salmon out of the country in a raw state, and asked the Minister to put an embargo on salmon going out of the country in a raw state.

On March 24th the Minister wrote the Cannery Association that the Government did not think it would be wise to change the regulations at the present time. The Minister's office is flooded with letters and telegrams from a few spoon bait fishermen who have contracted to sell their fish to American buyers, protesting against an embargo being put on salmon going out of the country in a raw state.

The writer has been in the Salmon canning business in British Columbia for 40 years, and I would like to point out the serious loss it is to the residents and salmon packers of B.C. We at Nootka Sound on the West Coast of Vancouver Island have a large canning plant that stands us more than \$165,000 and it averages \$5,000 per year for up-keep. We employ 5 men with families the year round, and when we are packing fish we employ upwards of 200 hands, women and men.

In our fishing waters we have only a low grade fish, mostly dog salmon or chums. We also have an early run of spring salmon caught with spoon bait in the Pacific Ocean off the West Coast of Vancouver Island. These spring salmon are an excellent quality, and are mostly mild cured in salt. The United States is a large market for mild cured fish, and in order for us to market our mild cured fish in the United States we must pay duty on the fish and containers. This gives the United States packers a great advantage over us, and they come here in their own boats, buy the fish with Canadian Funds, thereby getting advantage of the exchange. They sell gasoline to the fishermen cheaper than we can buy it in Vancouver or Victoria, and they do not pay duty on the raw fish going into the United States; nor do they pay any Licenses or other fees to the Dominion or Provincial Governments. Each canner here pays \$500 to the Dominion Government, and \$100.00 to the Provincial Government for a license to operate.

These spring salmon are a good canning fish, and we have built up a large trade for these fish in cans, but we cannot see our way clear to open up our cannery, as we cannot compete with the American Buyers. If there was an export duty or an embargo put on the raw fish, we could compete with them, for if the Americans were compelled to mild cure or can the fish here, they would be compelled to pay the same Government taxes and licenses that we are compelled to pay, and would require to pay duty on the cured article going into the United States. This would put us all on an equal basis, and would give employment to hundreds of hands living in our country, and the Government would get the Sales Tax as well, which would be a large revenue to the country.

[Mr. William R. Lord]

As the lower grades of fish, dog salmon or pinks, a cannery would require to put up a large pack of these fish to make expenses.

I will here point out what the Provincial and Dominion Governments: also labour and supply houses, would benefit if a pack of 50,000 cases of chum or dog salmon would be packed in our plant at Nootka, B.C.

Dominion Canning License..	\$ 500 00
Provincial Canning License..	100 00
4 Dominion Seine Licenses at \$300.00 each.. . . .	1,200 00
4 Provincial Seine Licenses at \$50.00 each.. . . .	200 00
Dominion Tax on 400,000 fish caught in seines $\frac{1}{2}$ cent each..	2,000 00
Dominion Tax on 50,000 cases canned fish 3 cents each case..	1,500 00
Provincial Tax on 50,000 cases canned fish 4 cents each case..	2,000 00
	<hr/>
	7,500 00
If the pack sold for \$5.00 per case, the Government would receive 3 per cent Sales Tax, or,.. . . .	7,500 00
	<hr/>
	\$ 15,000 00
Labour, cans, boxes, freight, not including fish \$4 per case..	200,000 00
	<hr/>
Total..	\$ 215,000 00

There are ten Canneries on Vancouver Island, and if they operate and average 50,000 cases, it would mean a great deal to the country.

If the Government will not come to our rescue we will not be able to operate our canneries.

The Canneries of Vancouver Island, District Number 3, are the ones which are affected by the American buyers, as we are in such close proximity to the United States, and practically all the fish packed in these canneries are a low grade fish, and we require to put up a large pack to make it worth while to operate, as our overhead expenses are large. The low grade fish taken from British Columbia waters by the American packers are sold as Canadian fish; as these fish are carried in vessels a long distance, they are in poor condition for canning, and it gives the fish we pack a black eye in the markets of the World. We have information that salmon taken from Canada and packed in the United States has been condemned by the United States Government as not being for food. If these fish were packed in Canada close to the fishing grounds, it would raise the standard of quality of the fish in the markets of the world, and, in time, would enable the Canadian packers to pay more for the raw material, as is now the case with sockeye salmon, owing to it being packed on the fishing ground, as sockeye salmon have not been exported for several years for canning purposes in the United States.

(Sgd.) W. R. LORD,
President and Manager,
Nootka Packing Company, Ltd.

By the Chairman:

Q. Would you like to make a statement on the whole situation?—A. I would do anything the Committee would like me to do in regard to anything with the Salmon Fisheries in British Columbia.

Q. Suppose you go on in your own way?—A. On the preservation of fish?

Q. On the embargo on anything you like, we would like to get all the information we can?—A. The salmon situation in British Columbia to-day requires very serious consideration by the Department of Fisheries. I have been in business there since 1882. When I first went to Fraser River the canners could not handle one twentieth part of the fish that was caught, and that was going on for years and years, that is in what we would call the big year, which is every four years. The other years were not quite so big, but now that fourth year is cut down so that there is practically no fish on Fraser River. In fact there is not enough sockeye there to pay the canners to operate, and that is due to the extensive fishing on Puget Sound by traps in particular. These fish along the Straits of Juan de Fuca came up by Puget Sound up into the Fraser River, I could not tell you how many traps there are there. Mr. Found could tell you, there must be at least forty or fifty.

Mr. FOUND: A great many more.

By Mr. Dickie:

Q. Describe the traps a little bit?—A. For instance, (illustrating), here is the shore line. Here is a lead that comes right into the shore, a trap lead extending right in to the shore. The salmon, come in this way if they are going into the Sound, in here to the Fraser River and they will strike this lead. This lead leads them into here and the construction of it prevents them from coming out. Then they go from this into the pot. You see there is absolutely no chance for fish striking that lead to get past it at all.

Q. That is the intention of the trap?—A. Yes. But it gets anything that comes within that and these are, I guess some of them are one quarter of a mile long; it all depends on the depth of the water, so that is what is depleting the fish in the Fraser River to-day.

By the Chairman:

Q. Who operates those?—A. The Americans in Pudget Sound.

Q. Do you have any of those traps in the Canadian waters?—A. Yes. On the south end of Vancouver Island but what they get there of course the Americans do not get. That is about the size of it. If those traps were not there, the Americans would get the fish that they catch, because they all go up through Pudget Sound, and the only way possible to save this, is to close it down tight, for, I should suggest, eight years. The life of a salmon is four years.

Q. You mean to close down the whole of the fishery?—A. Yes, close it down solid for the Fraser River, for the sockeye.

By Mr. Dickie:

Q. What about the Washington traps?—A. If they don't close what is the good of Canada closing theirs.

Q. There is no use closing up the Fraser River, unless you get the traps closed?—A. No, if the Americans won't agree to close it down, fish it out and settle it.

Mr. FOUND: I think Mr. Lord is speaking of the general terms as it is understood on the Pacific Coast, that is fish making for the Fraser River?

WITNESS: That is the only solution I see to the Fraser River fishing.

Q. That would mean legislation with the United States?—A. Yes, the fisheries of that district of the Pacific Coast are controlled by the State of Washington.

[Mr. William R. Lord]

By the Chairman:

Q. Have you got any suggestion as to how that could be brought about?—A. The way it could be brought about—we have tried to bring it about, to get them to agree to close down, but they won't agree to it. They want to close down certain things, and they want us to close down certain things, but they want to get all the fish, and they don't agree among themselves, therefore they won't do anything.

Q. Is there any limit to the distance where they can set these traps in Canadian waters?—A. They set them right up to the boundary line. In fact from Point Roberts up to the boundary line they have the traps.

By Mr. Dickie:

Q. What about the embargo? How does it adversely affect shipping in British Columbia?—A. On the Fraser River we have several species of salmon.

Q. Before you get onto the embargo, what do think about hatcheries?—A. I think hatcheries are alright if they are worked right.

Q. What do you think of the present system, the system they have?—A. I think this spawn bearing scheme is the proper thing, although I would not say anything about hatcheries, I really do not know anything about them.

Q. You are in favour of artificial propagation?—A. Yes, I am.

By the Chairman:

Q. Where do you operate on the Fraser River?—A. I have operated on all the rivers in British Columbia in my forty years there, but I am from the West Coast of Vancouver Island, now Nootka. We don't have any sockeye fish there. They are lower grades of fish. What I came here for in the first place was to ask you to put an embargo on the fish to keep the Americans out.

Q. What advantage would that be?—A. You see the way we are taxed, we cannot compete with them because they do not pay any taxes coming in here for our fish. If there was an embargo or an export duty put on them we could compete with them. Here are some figures I got out for some 50,000 case lots of the lowest grade of fish we have in British Columbia, Dog Salmon or Pinks. I here point out what the Dominion Government and also labour and supply houses would benefit if a pack of 50,000 cases of chum or dog salmon would be packed in our plant at Nootka.

Dominion Canning License..	\$ 500 00
Provincial Canning License..	100 00
4 Dominion Seine Licenses, \$300 each..	1,200 00
4 Provincial Seine Licenses, \$50 each..	200 00
Dominion Tax on 400,000 fish caught in seine $\frac{1}{2}$ cent each..	2,000 00
Dominion Tax on 50,000 cases canned fish 3 cents each case..	1,500 00
Provincial Tax on 50,000 cases canned fish 4 cents each case..	2,000 00
	<hr/>
	\$ 7,500 00

If the pack is sold for \$5 per case the Government would receive 3 per cent sales tax, or..	7,500 00
Labour, cans, boxes, freight, not including fish, \$4.00 per case..	\$ 200,000 00
	<hr/>

\$ 215,000 00

[Mr. William R. Lord]

There is \$7,500 that we are paying in taxes to put up that 50,000 cases. If the pack sold at \$5 per case, the Government would receive 3 per cent sales tax, making a total of \$15,000.

Q. What part of that is Federal and what part Provincial?—A. One half.

Q. Approximately how many canneries are operating in British Columbia?—

A. I think about 75 canneries in B.C. altogether, but there are only about one third of them operating.

Q. They pay an annual tax of \$5 to the Dominion Government?—A. Yes.

Q. They only pay that in case they operate?—A. Yes.

Q. If a cannery is closed down, they don't pay any taxes for that year?—A. No, I should not think so.

Mr. FOUND: They don't pay if they don't operate? They don't have to take out a license unless they operate?

By the Chairman:

Q. What does that mean in labour?—A. Labour, cans, boxes, freight, etc., that would mean \$200,000. That would mean a total of \$215,000 that the country would benefit by the 50,000 cases if there was an embargo put on them. The way it is now the fish go out of the country without any tax at all, only a license.

Q. You spoke of 3 per cent sales tax? That amounts to how much?—A. \$7,500.

Q. Would that be sold in Canada or for export?—A. This kind of fish is mostly all export.

Q. Would you pay 3 per cent on export fish?—A. Yes.

Mr. FOUND: It is part of the license fee. The license fee for the canner is \$400 plus 4 cents per case for sockeye, and 3 cents a case for each coloured species of fish.

WITNESS: This 3 per cent is the sales tax.

By the Chairman:

Q. If there is 3 per cent sales tax on fish exported to foreign countries—I thought it only applied to local canneries?—A. This was only put on here last year, I don't think there is any rebate on it.

By Mr. Hoey:

Q. Do you wish to have an embargo put on to prevent the canners from exporting fish?—A. Not the canners, the fishermen.

Q. In the raw state?—A. Yes.

Q. Compel them to be canned?—A. Yes, in some way.

Q. I understand the American buyers comes in and buys in competition with the Canadian buyers?—A. Yes.

By the Chairman:

Q. Why would they prefer to sell to the American buyers?—A. Because the American buyers bring in their gasoline cheaper than we can buy it and sell it at cost price. They come in with their own boats and sell their gasoline. They come in there with Canadian money and get the Canadian exchange on it when salmon runs 75 pounds to the case. We pay for 75 pounds of fish that we pack. 3 per cent on that is quite a leverage they have over us. Then our freight rates from the time the cases leave Vancouver until they come back for them cost us 27 cents a case.

Q. Would not the American packers have the same expense?—A. No, the American packers would not have the same expense, they get their fish and take them to their plants. We have to collect our fish, too. It will cost us as much to collect our fish as it does them. We figure on 35 cents a case for collecting fish.

[Mr. William R. Lord]

Q. Your proposition is that those fishermen should only be allowed to sell to you, to the Canadian canneries, I don't mean to your cannery alone, but to the Canadian canners?—A. What I mean to say is that they should be compelled to sell to Canadians, to a plant in Canada.

By Mr. McQuarrie:

Q. They would not be entitled to get the value of any other market but this one market, the benefit of this one market?—A. If it is packed in British Columbia it would go to the same market any way.

Q. If people came in from the United States to buy fish from the fishermen they could not sell them. That is your proposition? Buyers coming in from the United States, going to fishermen and offering better prices than you are giving, the fishermen would not be allowed to sell to those outside buyers, that is your proposition?—A. That is the idea.

Q. That is your proposition?—A. Yes.

By the Chairman:

Q. They could sell to the American buyers, but before they could take them to the United States they would have to pay an export duty?

Mr. McQUARRIE: It seems to me the proposition is one that could not be permitted.

The CHAIRMAN: He means an embargo against exports.

WITNESS: Let them buy them and process them here. Let them pay their license the same as we do.

By Mr. McQuarrie:

Q. That is Americans coming in here to buy fish should not take that raw fish out of the country?—A. Unless they processed it.

Q. In its natural quality they could not take it out?—A. No.

Q. So you would cut the fishermen out of that market altogether?—A. That is what I mean. Put the American buyers on an equal basis with us.

Q. Would not the result of that be that you would control the prices, the canners on this side of the line could fix the price and say to the fishermen: "Now you will not get higher prices than that. We will not give it to you."—A. It would cut it down to a working basis if they would have to pay these licenses and freight that we have to pay, then we would have to compete with them.

Q. That is your proposition?—A. Yes.

Q. You then would have the fixing of prices?—A. We then would have the fixing of prices.

By the Chairman:

Q. If I understand you, there is no license for buying fish?—A. The license is to can them. It costs them \$1 for a license to buy fish.

By Mr. McQuarrie:

Q. Is it not a fact, Mr. Lord, that the cannerymen have been trying to get this embargo for many years?—A. No, I never heard of it before until this year.

Q. I have heard of it. I have been fighting it for years, as representing the fishermen. You have never heard of it before?—A. We have never tried to get an embargo. The Americans have fished all the waters out and they are going to come over here very extensively this year.

Q. Were you not a party to the demand which has been made and repeated from time to time by the cannerymen of British Columbia for a number of years that this embargo should be put on?—A. No, not until this year.

Q. You just got into it this year?—A. Yes.

[Mr. William R. Lord]

Q. So it is a new story as far as you are concerned?—A. Yes.

Q. But as a matter of fact it is an old story so far as the cannery interests are concerned?—A. I have had no interest in the Association until this year.

Q. Are you not in the Association?—A. I am this year.

Q. You just got in this year?—A. Yes.

Q. You said a few minutes ago that there was an embargo on the export of sockeye?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you know when that was put on?—A. No, I don't know. Seven or eight years ago, I think.

Mr. FOUND: In 1894 at least.

By Mr. McQuarrie:

Q. Do you know the conditions under which that embargo was put on?—A. No, I don't remember that. I was not down the Fraser at that time so I don't know.

Q. Do you know the undertaking that was made by the cannery men at that time in regard to prices?—A. No, I don't know. I was not on the Fraser at that time.

Q. Don't you know at that time the cannerymen agreed that if an embargo was put on the export of sockeye that the cannerymen on this side of the line would pay at all times prevailing prices or the prices prevailing on the other side of the line?—A. We are willing to do that to-day.

Q. But that is the arrangement in regard to sockeye?—A. Yes.

Q. Now you are willing to do the same thing in connection with the others?—A. Yes.

Q. Is that the proposition being made by the cannerymen?—A. That is what we want.

Q. Or is it your own individual proposition?—A. Of course, I have come here on my own account. They want the same thing as I do, but we will pay the same price as they will pay over there, if there is an embargo put on the fish, because if there is an embargo or an export duty put on the fish they cannot come over here and beat us out, because the price is set on the other side and we can pay the same price over here as they can over there.

Q. You are willing to do that?—A. Yes.

Q. Is your association willing to do that?—A. Sure, they would be.

Q. In the matter of the Japanese, I was going to ask you if you employ Japanese fishermen?—A. I employ 7.

Q. How many white men have you got?—A. We have three crews of Whites and one crew of Japs.

By Mr. Bancroft:

Q. I wanted to ask Mr. Lord if this proposition he is submitting for an embargo on fish would benefit the fishermen?—A. The fisherman would get as much for the fish as he is getting now, as far as that is concerned, but it would benefit the country so much more if the fish was handled here. We are only canning fish a few months in the year, and there are a lot of these people hanging around for the purpose of working at it, and if this fish goes out of the country, they don't get any work.

Q. They would not work under any hardship because of this embargo?—A. They would get more work out of it. Nearly all the canning work is piecework.

Q. Is there anything in this embargo to prevent Americans coming in here the same as Canadians?—A. No. Let them come in here and spend their money.

Mr. DICKIE: It is practically on a par with our provincial timber. None of our provincial timber can go out of the province; we don't allow it. We want the labour in our province and we want to work it up into lumber. We don't want our raw material going across because of these regulations on the part of the province of British Columbia. We have great American saw mills coming into our province

[Mr. William R. Lord]

and they employ vast amounts of labour and the money remains in our country, and it is just along the same lines as what Mr. Lord is advocating with respect to the fish, as I understand it.

Mr. STORK: I think Mr. Dickie is not altogether conversant with new conditions in British Columbia with regard to the export of logs. With all deference to Mr. Dickie's remarks, I think he will find that there is a great movement on right now and has been for the last year in the export of logs to Japan. The Japanese do not want to pay our high cost of production in British Columbia, and recently there has developed a tremendous trade in logs and I think the northern part of British Columbia and the other southern parts are shipping lumber in the raw state to Japan. I do not think there is any embargo being enforced on logs.

Mr. DICKIE: It may have been allowed because of conditions that prevail at present. I remember a few years ago we had an overplus of logs on the market. We had a restricted market for our lumber so that the Government relaxed their regulations. What Mr. Stork says is undoubtedly true, although from the part of the country with which I am most conversant, the only stuff we ship to Japan is what are called "Jap Squares." It is a partly manufactured cargo that goes and I think that was because of the very very severe straights that the lumbermen found themselves in during the war, or since the war, that the Government should probably relax the regulations in that respect.

Q. With regard to that agreement entered into with the canners to pay the same price for sockeye on the other side as on this side, has that been carried out?
—A. Yes.

By Mr. McQuarrie:

Q. This is quite a big question. I know they are not satisfied with the arrangement as to the sockeye. It has not been lived up to, the arrangement did not do them any good at all. The cannerymen did not live up to their agreement. That may or may not be true. I am simply telling you what is reported to me by the fishermen.—A. Take the price for instance paid for sockeye in British Columbia and compare it with Puget Sound. We are paying 25 cents more for our sockeye salmon in British Columbia than on the Puget Sound.

Mr. MCQUARRIE: A little later on we ought to hear the fishermen's side of it. I know there is the other side.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lord says they pay as much, that is all we can get on that to-day.

By Mr. McQuarrie:

Q. I was going to ask Mr. Lord about the use of seines. Is it not a fact there is a great deal of complaint about the use of seines, and the use of seine nets, that it should be done away with?—A. If you do away with it you are doing away with the most suitable net used for the preservation of fish, but it should be limited to depth and length. In the large rivers you cannot use seines on account of the currents, but all outside the low-grade fish which is in the outside waters, these fish such as Dog salmon, Cohoes, Hump Backs, they spawn at the mouth of creeks and the water shallows up from these rivers, and if you fish seines entirely and not allow seines to be used under 17 fathoms deep they could not possibly get close to it, but if you allow them to fish with drag-seines and gill-nets, they just put their nets across the mouth of the river. At high water, where we have extreme tides of 27 feet, they put it across the mouth of the river and corral the fish in there, and when the tide goes out they fish them out with pitch forks. That is the kind of fish they sell to them. We could not buy that sort of fish in Canada.

Q. Would you prohibit the export of that sort of fish?—A. Certainly. A man should be fined for canning it.

[Mr. William R. Lord]

Q. Those fish are full of spawn at the time?—A. Yes. Those fish come in there and spawn and they should be left alone, and as for policing it we have our department doing all they can, but you would have to have a man on every stream, and that man would have to be there night and day. Take on the West Coast of Vancouver Island, I guess there would be 150 or 200 salmon streams; it would take a man on each stream whereas you want to know if they could not get near the rivers it would be a protection to the fish. That is the only way to protect fish.

By the Chairman:

Q. What is the regulation as to the size of the mesh?—A. $3\frac{1}{2}$ -inch. There is a regulation size with gill-nets. In fact there is a regulation size for seines, but the salmon would never gill in that. They are not supposed to gill. That is the reason we use a small mesh net.

Q. Are you allowed to take all sized salmon that go in that seine?—A. Yes.

Q. No difference how small they are?—A. You see the fish are all one age when they come in there. You don't get the young fish, they don't come in until they come to spawn in there.

Q. You said those fish which the Americans purchase are not in as good condition as the ones canned by the Canadian canners, would not that be of advantage to the Canadian canners? Would not they get more money for the better quality of fish?—A. Yes, but we are trying to work up a trade for this low grade fish, as the sockeye is nearly fished out. We are trying to build up a trade and we want it canned right. They don't care what the fish is like. They will put it in the cans if they possibly can raise it up, an iron chink.

Q. Would not that fish be in poor condition?—A. Sure, it would, and that is what hurts the low grade fish to-day.

Q. If the low grade fish were in better condition, would you not get a better trade for it?—A. Surely.

By Mr. Stork:

Q. Do any of our own canners at times put up fish that is not marketable?—A. During the war some men went into the business that did not understand it, and they packed some that was not very right.

Q. I have heard—I would not say how true it is, but I have heard it repeated time and again, that one very large cannery in the North practically went broke by reason of the fact that they put up 10,000 cases of fish which latter on were condemned.—A. Yes, I know it.

Q. So that the canning of poor fish, is not entirely confined to the American canners. Once in a while some of our own slip in on the same kind of a game?—A. That fish was taken too far. I know the cannery you refer to. Yes, that fish came from Queen Charlotte Islands, that is sixty miles of open water. With their small boats they could not make the time, with their fish carriers, therefore the fish was stale. It was not that they were rotten from being on the spawning grounds.

Q. The result would be the same?

By the Chairman:

Q. They would be soft?—A. They were soft.

By Mr. Stork:

Q. One of the difficulties there in connection with the operations of our canners is this, to a large extent. They are operated on a competitive basis. His business in life is to get up a pack this season. In order to get that pack up he will do things that he otherwise would not do. If he does not make a success of his cannery pack this year he is not employed next year, that is he runs that risk and in one instance they are discussing right now, I think it is due perhaps to the anxiety on the part of the cannerymen to get a full pack and he took a chance on a certain large quantity

[Mr. William R. Lord]

of fish to be canned and he put them through any how with the result that some 10,000 cases were refused later on, which very seriously embarrassed him financially. Later on he had it thrown back on his hands.—A. I think that is wrong. On two occasions the fish were in that boat from six to seven days before he canned them, and the manager of the cannery thought he would take a chance and can them rather than throw them away as they were paid for.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is there no Government inspection of those canneries as to the quality of fish that is put up?

WITNESS: Yes there is, but there was not at the time this fish was refused, but five years ago, down in the Queen Charlotte Island there were no inspectors there at that time, but we had an inspector with us. That part of it is looked after alright. There was one thing—Mr. McQuarrie made a remark in his speech with regard to the cannerymen discriminating against white fishermen. I don't know of any instance where the white fisherman has been refused, a white British subject has been refused a canneryman license, and I think Mr. Found and Mr. Johnson will back me up in that, returned soldier or any other man.

By Mr. McQuarrie:

Q. I referred to the treatment accorded by the cannerymen to the white men, I said according to my information the cannerymen in the north were discriminating against the white men in favour of the Japanese. I was told last year, the word was sent forth by the cannerymen that they would not employ white men at all, where they could get Japanese, they were going to get them because they were more satisfactory to them. Whether those men were returned soldiers or whether they were not they would not have anything to do with them.—A. Well, I will tell you I never heard of it.

By the Chairman:

Q. Can you hire them cheaper than the white men?—A. No. You cannot get fish cheaper from the Japanese than from the white men.

By Mr. McQuarrie:

Q. Explain how it is there are so many Japanese employed in the fisheries in British Columbia?—A. Because the white man won't work. He wants to sit back and get his money for doing nothing, curse the Government for not putting in public works. I will give you an instance of it in Nootka Island. If these people had not the land tied up there we could get those Scotch fishermen out there and they would have a market garden and they would catch our fish and they are the best fishermen there are, but no, those fellows won't work, in anyway, shape or form. We are no good because we will not give them work. We give them work and they are not worth their salt. I have offered those men \$4 a cord for wood, to take 400 or 600 cords a year, \$4 a cord piled on the edge of the bank where the scow can get at it, but they will not do it.

Q. You say the white men in British Columbia won't work?—A. Yes, and they are that class of people on the West Coast of Vancouver Island, I don't say generally.

Q. I was speaking generally. You must have seen the time when the white men did the fishing in British Columbia?—A. There are more white men fishing now in British Columbia than there ever were.

Q. The Japanese have always been in the preponderance?—A. The Japanese started fishing on the Fraser River in 1884.

Q. You say at that time that they came in great numbers?—A. No.

Q. All at once, they gradually worked up in the industry?—A. Yes.

Q. There was a time when the white men did the fishing before the Japanese came?—A. The Indians have always done the bulk of the fishing.

[Mr. William R. Lord]

Q. Before the Japanese came the white men and the Indians always did the fishing?—A. Yes, and they are doing it yet.

Q. They are doing more than the Japanese? You say they are doing more than the Japanese? Is it not a fact that the Japanese are doing most of the fishing in British Columbia?—A. There are not more Japanese fishing than Indians, but By George they catch a darn-sight more fish.

Q. You say there are as many Indians fishing in British Columbia as there are Japanese?—A. Yes, there are more.

Q. You are wrong in that according to statistics?—A. All the statistics you see is gill-netting where each individual has to have a license, but what about our seines. There is only one seine license with 7 of a crew on it.

By the Chairman:

Q. I did not quite understand your reason why if the white men who are at present fishing in British Columbia if they are not satisfactory, why you cannot get other men in there to fish, those Scotch fishermen. Why can't they come in there and fish?—A. Because the land is tied up. Those people want to make a living in other ways. This salmon fishing is only for a small part of the year, and the land is tied up with a lot of useless men who won't grow their own vegetables.

By Mr. McQuarrie:

Q. Is the land held in large blocks?—A. Most of it in forty-acre blocks.

Q. You say the people who live on it won't work it?—A. Yes, they will pay \$5 a ton to get their vegetables down in Victoria.

Q. Do they own the land, those settlers?—A. Yes. Crown grant, pre-emption.

Q. If there were no Japanese there, what would happen in connection with the fishermen?—A. I don't think there would be any canneries.

Q. You could not get along without the Japanese?—A. Not at the present time unless you encouraged some white men to come in and fish. I don't see why the white man should kick about the Japanese, he has the same chance as the Japanese.

Q. Do the Japanese live the same way as the white man?—A. He spends his money in the country the same as they do, but the white man makes it out that the Japanese are catching all the fish, that they don't get any chance. A good white fisherman will catch more fish than the Japanese out there, because his judgment is better.

Q. Your idea is to let the Japanese come in?—A. No, I would say that the immigration of the Japanese should be stopped.

Q. Why should you stop them?—A. There are enough here now to my mind.

By the Chairman:

Q. You are in favour of the white men if they will only fish?—A. Yes. We will buy fish from the white men in preference to a Japanese any day.

Q. We have had some discussion in reference to a number of Indians and Japanese now working in the fisheries. It may be a good idea at this stage to get every one of the officials of the department, and the statistics of the number of fishermen in this district? Can you get that, Mr. Johnson?

Mr. JOHNSON: Yes. It may be desirable, if the Committee so regard it that at this stage a correct statement of the year 1921 should be made. We find that in gill nets last year the total number of licenses in British Columbia was 4,777. Of these 4,777 there were 2,096 Japanese. Trolling, there was a total number of 1,452, and 504 of that 1,452 were Japanese. The totals of gill-netting and trolling for 1921 was 6,229.

By the Chairman:

Q. Of all classes?

Mr. JOHNSON: Yes, of that amount 2,600 were Japanese.

[Mr. William R. Lord]

By the Chairman:

Q. Have you got the Indians?

Mr. JOHNSON: The total number of Indians was 1,319. Whites, 2,205. This does not embrace the seines.

WITNESS: That means one man to the boat. On the Fraser it means two. There would be only one license taken out for a boat. On account of the currents they require two men to a boat, so you see you cannot tell by that the actual men of different nationalities that are fishing.

By Mr. Found:

Q. Why not?—A. Because they are not licensed. On rivers actually there is only one man to a boat.

By Mr. Stork:

Q. According to that, a white man could get a license. If there are two men in the boat he could take a Jap along with him as an associate?—A. Yes.

By the Chairman:

Q. Those figures you have given us are not licenses issued to the different nationalities or to the actual fishermen employed in the fisheries?

Mr. JOHNSON: Not licensed.

Q. Have you got the actual number of men employed?

Mr. FOUND: No. This bears out the statement Mr. Lord made. He will see that those figures are just as relatively true because in the East Coast out of 10 the Indians work together, the white men work together, the Japs work together, but where there are two men in a boat. There are two Japs, two Indians or two white men.—A. On the seines there would be 7.

By Mr. Stork:

Q. That is a record only of those who have licenses? There are also a large number who are unrecorded, that is where there are two men in a boat and only one man has a license, he has an associate with him; it may be the white man who has the license, and to my certain information the practice is prevalent that the white man gets a license and turns it over to an Oriental, and the Oriental works on the job with him. We have not got a complete record of all the men.

Mr. FOUND: That is quite true.

By Mr. Stork:

Q. Would not this be an improvement to check it up, to have a regulation that all men, even though the license is given at the present time to one man only, to have every man engaged in fishing supplied with a license.

Mr. FOUND: It would be very satisfactory to us. The general feeling is that the fees are fairly heavy now and if you require two licenses to a boat in a place where the currents are such that it requires two men to operate the boat, it will mean double the fee on that. It is merely on account of the heaviness of the current you require two men. A gill-net license is \$10. There is the provincial tax as well, \$5. A trolling license at the present time is \$5.

By the Chairman:

Q. How much is the fee? Is it \$10 for each district?

Mr. FOUND: The same fee for each district?

Q. Then in three districts you would have to pay three license fees?—A. That is the general practice. There is nothing to prevent the transfer of one license from one district to another if there is good cause for it.

[Mr. William R. Lord]

By the Chairman:

Q. In order to follow up Mr. Stork's question, did I understand you to say it would be a good idea, in case there were four or five men fishing in a boat, for each man to have a license?—A. That was his suggestion.

Q. Why could you not issue the license to the man in charge of the boat? I do not see why you should force that boat to pay more than one license.

Mr. FOUND: The regulations would have to be kept in mind all the way along. The existing regulation contemplates the license to the boat, and it has not been changed since; the policy has been changed of an unlimited number of licenses.

By Mr. Morrissy:

Q. Supposing one man took out four or five licenses, where would he be then?

Mr. FOUND: He would be able to operate four or five boats, unless you are going to have a boat pullers' license.

Q. Where would a man be with four or five licenses?

Mr. FOUND: I do not quite understand the purport of the question.

By Mr. Morrissy:

Q. Supposing you had a license for four or five boats, you want to get every man down as having a license.

Mr. FOUND: Yes.

By Mr. Morrissy:

Q. But would you put the other man in if the one man had a license for four or five boats?

The CHAIRMAN: We are getting away from the information we are trying to get. The question was brought up as to the number of Japanese, Indians and white men fishing in British Columbia, but from the statistics the department gave us all the information they could give us as to the number of licenses issued in British Columbia. We want to know whether we could not devise some scheme to know whether it was a one-man license or a two-man license or what it was.

By Mr. Stork:

Q. I don't want to add additional expense to the boat.

Mr. FOUND: It could readily be done.

By Mr. Stork:

Q. Supposing there are two men in a boat, one is a white man, the other is a Jap. We only have a record of the white man who has the license for it. What I am trying to get at is the fellow who works with him or the total number of fishermen. That is the point I am working at.—A. There is a record of that. We report on every man we hire. There is a certain department here has that.

Mr. FOUND: We have the outside information but in issuing the license we keep the origin or nationality of each individual, every man has to be a British subject, but we follow him down no matter what nationality he is. We could do the same thing so far as where a second man is required. The Committee will readily understand the situation in what is referred to as gill-net fishing. It is all one boat that operates things. They have a long net of 150 fathoms in length. In certain districts where the current and tides are not heavy, one man can handle the boat and a net quite readily. In certain other districts where the currents are different, one man has all he can do to attend to the boat and another attends to the net. One man is licensed and the other is not. The other man goes as a boat puller. The only difficulty in licensing them is that you would have to consider whether you are

[Mr. William R. Lord]

going to make it more restrictive than you are doing now. At the present time a man need not be a British subject who is hired as a boat puller, any more than a man in a cannery or a lumber district need be a British subject.

By the Chairman:

Q. As I understand Mr. Johnson's statement he can only give us the number of licenses issued. You cannot give us them by nationality.

Mr. JOHNSON: No, I cannot give you that.

By Mr. McQuarrie:

Q. There are a lot of Chinamen employed in the canneries?—A. Some of them have.

Q. A lot of them?—A. In our cannery, with a capacity of 1,200 cases a day we had twelve Chinese, 150 Indians, 150 women and the balance men.

Q. Would that be about the average proportion?—A. No, it is not. Our cannery is more automatic than most of them.

Q. As a general thing in other canneries there are a great many Chinese employed?—A. Yes, but there are not as many as there used to be.

By the Chairman:

Q. Those men would not be fishermen that you are speaking of now, those are labourers?

Mr. McQUARRIE: Yes.

By the Chairman:

Q. But we want to try and get information as to the number of men employed of different nationalities.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Yes.

By Mr. Neill:

Q. I would like to ask, Mr. Chairman—I understand he was talking about the embargo on account of the fish going out of the district that he lives in, that I represent. I would like to ask him if last year there was much fish went over to the American side?—A. There would be two-thirds of the spring salmon caught went over to the other side last year.

Q. The whole pack of the West Coast?—A. They did not seine them last year.

Q. There was a comparatively small amount went over to the other side?—A. Yes, but this year they are preparing for big packs.

Q. I understand, from what I am told, you said the canning business last year was unremunerative?—A. Yes.

Q. You found that yourself?—A. I should say I did, to the extent of \$30,000.

Q. Your loss of \$30,000 was not due to the embargo. This was due to some other conditions than of the fish going there. You have already stated the time was limited?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Clark:

Q. You are not stating that the loss was due to an absence of an embargo?—A. No. But I am stating they are making big preparations to come over there.

Q. Your suggestion is to put the low grade fish on the same basis as the high grade fish?—A. Yes.

Q. Is that your object, in order to obviate the loss?—A. No, so that we can afford to make a little money out of it.

Q. Might I understand that last year there was no sale for fish in any of the markets of the world?—A. Yes.

[Mr. William R. Lord]

Q. The canners had to sell their fish at about 25 per cent, at least about one-quarter of what they previously received for it, and at a loss of about 50 per cent?—A. The pack that averaged \$5.50 a case was carried over two years and sold for \$2.80.

By Mr. Neill:

Q. This desire for an embargo is caused by the fear of what may happen rather than what has happened?—A. Yes.

By Mr. McQuarrie:

Q. If you are prepared to pay the same price as the Americans, why should not our fishermen sell to you as readily as they sell to the Americans?—A. Those fellows have contracted with the American buyers without consulting us at all, and they don't ask us.

Q. Why should they prefer to deal with the Americans?—A. Because they can get their gasoline. They don't have to pay any freight. They buy it cheaper than we buy it, and they don't consider it is costing them anything to bring it over here.

Q. Is there no duty?—A. No, no duty on gasoline.

Q. Is it not a fact that they deal with the Americans for two reasons, partly because the American buyers pay more, and partly because the American buyers are often there when the Canadian canneries won't buy at all? Is not that the reason that very often the American buyer will give them more and the Canadian canners are not on the job at all.—A. Of course, there was nobody after much fish last year.

Q. If you would not take the fish what would happen?—A. We will guarantee to take all the fish.

Q. Not last year?—A. We did, we took every fish last year. The cannerymen did not refuse to take any fish last year. They never did on the West Coast as far as I know. Those conditions will never arise again.

Q. If it did turn out in that way, that fishermen did have fish and you would not take them, they will simply have to throw them out into the gulf?—A. They would not have to do it any more.

Q. Is there any understanding by the canneries as to the price you pay the fishermen each year? Do the canners fix a price to the fishermen?—A. The packers on the river do.

Q. The canners have an association?—A. Yes. The association does not fix a price. Where there is any fishing each cannery pays its own price.

Q. You say the cannerymen will undertake to accept all the fish the fisherymen will catch?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Neill:

Q. Is that on behalf of the cannerymen's association you make that statement?—A. I will take all the fish that is caught on the West Coast myself. I can handle them all myself.

By Mr. McQuarrie:

Q. And give the same price the Americans are paying?—A. Give the same price they are paying on the other side. They don't pay the same prices over there as we do here. That is where they get a leverage: they do not pay the same price we do over here.

Q. If you got this embargo on, the fishermen would get lower prices than if there was no embargo?—A. We want to get the prices down and get the same article they do.

Q. Your idea is to cut down the prices?—A. We want to get it to a working basis.

By Mr. Clark:

Q. Your object is to be able to can fish and sell it and compete in the world's markets with a similar production from the United States?—A. That is the idea.

[Mr. William R. Lord]

Q. That is the whole object?—A. Yes.

Q. In order to do so, you are imposing an embargo to compel the independent fishermen to accept a price that you can afford to pay for fish with a certain profit? A. Yes.

Q. And that price you will guarantee will equal the price being paid by the canners in the United States at their canneries?—A. Yes.

Q. Possibly not a price equal to what Americans will pay who come up the Coast into our waters and buy the fish there and at the same time deliver commodities on which there are no duties?—A. I don't quite get you.

Q. Possibly you will not pay as high a price as Americans will pay who travel from the United States up to our waters, and they are able to pay a slightly higher price there because of the fact that they are able to bring in commodities on which they are paying no duties and deliver them to the fishermen and pay no license fees and no tax to the Dominion or Provincial Government?—A. Yes. I will tell you, the whole thing is this: Put them on an equal basis with us; let them come in here and pay the licenses we do so that we can compete with them, then if they can do us up, if we cannot compete with them we deserve to be closed up.

Q. Is it a fact they also bring in commodities besides gasoline and pay no duty? A. Yes, they furnish the fishermen with tobacco at 100 per cent cheaper than we can buy it over here.

By Mr. Neill:

Q. Is not that smuggling?—A. Yes.

Q. That is not the province of this committee?—A. It is an advantage to them.

Mr. Clark:

Q. It is one of the reasons they can pay higher prices for fish in our waters.

By the Chairman:

Q. Have you seen the proposed new United States tariff, known as the McCumber tariff? A. Mr. Found called my attention to that. That is on fish?

Q. Yes. A. Yes.

Q. Do you remember the duties which are intended to be imposed with regard to fish going from Canada to the United States?—A. Yes. I understand it is 2 cents per pound to be put on it, but that has not passed the House yet.

Q. If this 2 cents a pound on salmon is imposed by the United States Government with the result that the American fishermen will have to pay that duty, taking them into the United States, would not that be as good as an embargo?—A. Yes.

Q. You would no need an embargo if that tariff goes into effect?—A. No.

By Mr. Ward:

Q. I think there was a question raised by this gentleman that might receive due consideration. In the province of Manitoba, that is entirely controlled by two American companies, those two American companies own the outfits, that is they supply the fishermen with the nets and everything and they have fishing as far out as lake Winnipeg and different points. Those companies are robbing the Government. They are not only fleecing the fishermen but they are fleecing the Government by evading income taxes. For instance, white fish is selling today in any big market for twenty-five or thirty-five cents per pound, and yet the fishermen are receiving from 5½ cents to 6 cents a pound for this fish, which were the prices they are being shipped out of Canada at, and thereby keeping down or showing a loss in the American owned concern, where if we had proper Government regulations those fish should be shipped out of Canada at probably 15 cents a pound, where they would show an immense profit, and so our Canadian Government is being ruthlessly fleeced by those

[Mr. William R. Lord]

fishermen. I say there is a point which I think should receive consideration, and possibly the point raised by Mr. Lord, that the American companies coming into Canadian waters on the Pacific Coast are not paying licenses. I think that is a point that has been overlooked by the department of Marine and Fisheries in the past.

By Mr. Morrissy:

Q. Another point I think we might consider, even although the American cannerymen should be willing to pay slightly more than our cannerymen can pay, and we all must realize that every cannery in British Columbia has been losing money in the last two years. Supposing they are willing to pay more than we can pay I don't think anybody in British Columbia would be prepared to say "Let them have all the fish they want on those terms." We would not have a cannery in Southern British Columbia if we allowed them to come over and pay a little more than our cannerymen could pay, they would take all our fish and we would have no canneries at all. I don't think even our fishermen would like that, and I want to have the good of the fishermen who are fishing, as much at heart as the cannerymen. On Puget Sound today they cannot use fish that is caught in the Southern British Columbia. Is not that a fact?—A. Yes.

Q. Why, if our cannerymen are paying all they can afford for salmon we would not want to see the industries wiped out and all this fish going across there in the raw state. I think it is a question of raw material going into another country. That should be considered.

The CHAIRMAN: I don't think you caught the question with regard to duty. There would be a duty of 2 cents per pound on fresh salmon going into the United States. Would not that satisfy the British Columbia canners?

Mr. MORRISY: I should think it would. *

By the Chairman:

Q. What do you think about that, Mr. Lord?—A. It makes a difference of \$1.50 a case to us.

By Mr. Clark:

Q. When does that come into effect?

The CHAIRMAN: I hope it will never go into effect myself, but it might.

Mr. CLARK: Is it not on the Statute Books now?

The CHAIRMAN: No, that is the McCumber tariff.

Mr. CLARK: We cannot consider that now.

The CHAIRMAN: When we know what will happen the McCumber tariff we can decide then.

Mr. CLARK: Then we are running the risk of the Americans coming in this year and buying the fish up wholesale, waiting to see what the United States is going to do. My idea is that we wait too much to see what the United States is going to do.

Q. May I ask the Departmental witnesses with regard to existing conditions on the export of sockeye salmon? What are these conditions roughly, and how have they worked in the past?

Mr. FOUND: There is a regulation since 1894 which prohibited the export of sockeye in raw condition from British Columbia, that has been a constant law since that time.

By the Chairman:

Q. Why was that regulation made?

Mr. FOUND: I can only assume, as the early records of the department were destroyed in the fire, I can only assume it is for the same reason that Mr. Lord is [Mr. William R. Lord]

urging it at the present time. At that time sockeye were the only fish that were being canned to any extent in the province. The other fish were not being sought for to any extent.

By Mr. McQuarrie:

Q. Have you a copy of the agreement that was signed by the cannerymen at that time?

Mr. FOUND: It was not at that time. Some years ago the question of rescinding that regulation was under consideration, and at that time the cannerymen of the Fraser River gave an undertaking that was regarded as satisfactory, and the regulation was not rescinded.

Mr. MCQUARRIE: Have you got a copy of that?

Mr. FOUND: I have not got it here.

Mr. MCQUARRIE: Can you produce it?

Mr. FOUND: It can be produced of course.

By Mr. Clark:

Q. Have you had any official complaint regarding the statements given by the cannerymen to the fishermen?—A. No, sir. I cannot say anything about it in the early years when there were very heavy runs in the big year in the Fraser River. There may have been complaints, but certainly not in ten years. No complaints have reached the department.

Q. It is a fact that there is no danger of scow loads of high grade of fish being dumped over in the future?—A. Nor any other fish.

Mr. NEILL: There are no scow loads of fish to take over.

Mr. FOUND: As far as the Fraser River, that is true. The demand for red fish is now such that any quantities can be put up that are available. It is a matter of getting as much as they can get.

Mr. STORK: We have had an embargo on sockeye for a great many years, and that embargo has not prevented the extermination of sockeye as far as Canada is concerned.

Mr. FOUND: As far as catching fish is concerned, it has not had any effect, because the demand for sockeye in the world is greater than production. The cannerymen will put up as much sockeye as they can get.

Mr. CLARK: Have any negotiations been carried on with the United States in recent years with regard to close seasons on the Fraser River?

Mr. FOUND: Yes.

Mr. CLARK: Within what period?

Mr. FOUND: They have been almost continuous, with a short intermission since 1906, resulting in the Treaty of 1908, which was never observed, as the regulations adopted under it were not approved by the United States Senate, and resulted in a second treaty, which has now been ratified.

Mr. CLARK: Is there any advantage to the United States to have a close season in the Fraser River for a number of years?—A. No important advantage. The only object would be to build up the fishery in British Columbia more than in the United States. The Fraser River run of salmon is a common fishery to Canada and the United States. I don't mean a common run of fish, but yet it is the same fish. The United States have had their chance at it before they came to the Fraser River.

By the Chairman:

Q. Have you any further statement you would like to make?

WITNESS: I think the cannerymen on the West Coast in particular deserve some consideration. We have started packing pilchard out on the West Coast. It is a new

[Mr. William R. Lord]

thing. We started packing four years ago. We spent \$36,000 so far in advertising this fish, and it is going to be one of the biggest industries in Canada. In California there are forty canneries packing the same fish, canneries that will average probably 75,000 cases to the cannery and we have more fish of that kind up there than they have, and we are the only ones who are packing them in large quantities. As I say, we have spent up to date, over \$36,000, and we have only the low grade salmon proposition out there. We have not the advantages the sockeye men have, because they get \$20 a case for their fish. If we can get \$4.50 for our fish we think we are doing well. Therefore, we have to put up a big pack of it, in order to pay our overhead, and we are advertising that kind of salmon and we are packing them in the proper way too, and I think we should have some consideration. I think they ought to be compelled to pay the same license we do and put us on an equal footing with them.

By Mr. Neill:

Q. What sort of pack of pilchards did you put up?—A. In the four years, 280,000 cases.

Q. That is extra to your salmon pack. Does not that help you out as against other cannerymen who have only the salmon to rely on? It allows your canneries to run longer than the other canneries who have only the salmon?—A. Yes.

Q. Is there any danger of those pilchards becoming intermittent?—A. The Indians say so, but they are there for five years now.

Q. The Indians claim they disappear for long periods?—A. They claim they come in for a year and then disappear for a long time, but they have been there continuously. From what I can make out, they have been there right along. They thought they were herrings.

Q. They are a very valuable fish?—A. Yes.

By Mr. McQuarrie:

Q. Do you know anything about the herring industry?—A. No. I don't handle herring at all.

By Mr. Clark:

Q. Are there any men in British Columbia whom you could suggest we should call before the Committee?—A. Yes. I should suggest you would get the inspectors if you want to get some information.

By the Chairman:

Q. Mr. Motherwell?—A. Yes, and Mr. Taylor. Each inspector should be asked to give his own views in his own district, because you see No. 1 district is practically a sockeye proposition only, that is the Fraser River. District No. 3 is the whole of Vancouver Island and the mainland as far up as Queen Charlotte Sound, and No. 2 comes above that again, between that and Alaska, and their fishing is above altogether.

By Mr. Neill:

Q. Have you been asked your opinion on the advisability of a fishery board in the West. I would like to ask your opinion as to whether you consider an advisory board of fisheries would be an advantage?—A. They have their inspectors there. Three deputies. I don't see why the Government should go to the expense of having a board out there. They would have the control in Ottawa anyway. What is the difference?

Mr. MORRISSY: I don't like to see Mr. Lord go on record with respect to his remarks about the white men not being just as good as they should be. I have known [Mr. William R. Lord]

Mr. Lord for forty years and I can assure you that a good white man has as good a friend in Mr. Lord as there is in British Columbia. He is referring to a few men around his country and I don't like to see that imputation from Mr. Lord go West.

WITNESS: I was only referring to the men around my own place.

Mr. NEILL: I can endorse that by my local knowledge of Mr. Lord also.

Mr. STORK: As I regard it, we are having an around-the-table-talk about this thing.

The CHAIRMAN: It might be as well for both reporters to change that answer of Mr. Lord's.

Mr. MCQUARRIE: Surely you cannot do that, I object to that.

WITNESS: I thought I mentioned the men on the West Coast.

Mr. MCQUARRIE: I asked Mr. Lord certain questions, and I submit I was not leading him into any trap at all, and I object to any insinuation of that kind.

The CHAIRMAN: But you are a lawyer.

Mr. MCQUARRIE: If we are going over that phase again, then I should have the privilege of again going over the ground with Mr. Lord.

WITNESS: I was only referring to the men I handle on the West Coast.

Mr. NEILL: I object to that statement, I come from the West Coast.

WITNESS: I say, men I handle up around my own place.

Mr. MCQUARRIE: I asked Mr. Lord why it was there were so many Japanese in the fishery industry and he said it was because the white men would not work.

WITNESS: I thought you were referring to my part of the fishing entirely.

Mr. MCQUARRIE: I object to this part being withdrawn from the record. The whole thing has been taken down in shorthand; let it stay there. And I object to anything being taken off the record. If you wish to go over it again, it is alright. Let him make a statement.

WITNESS: I thought you were referring to our own fishermen out there. I did not mean that generally, I will tell you that.

Mr. STORK: We ought to allow a certain amount of latitude here in this Committee. I know I am liable to say a lot of things in this Committee out of the fullness of my heart that I would not like to see in print. I think we ought to give each man the privilege of more or less revising the harsh sentences or the unguarded things he might say. I know Mr. Lord for many years and I, for one, would not want to see this thing go broadcast through the West because I think Mr. Lord has spoken here to us in the fullness of his heart, and I think we ought to be more or less lenient in regard to those things.

WITNESS: I surely did not mean it generally.

Mr. MCQUARRIE: Is this going to be a cooked-up proposition?

The CHAIRMAN: No, in the open.

Mr. CLARK: I am a lawyer too, I think we can put a man in a hole if we are representing a particular point of view and want to cross-examine a man as we would in court. I quite understand the impression Mr. Lord wanted to convey to us, and my interpretation of that was this, that there is a class of men, white and coloured, who are no good and I don't care where that goes, and I think we all agree with it. There is on the other hand, thank goodness, a large class that are really white men and I think that is the distinction Mr. Lord made, to my mind, but possibly under cross-examination he conveyed a different impression, but the impression he conveyed to me was that there is a poor class and we know that every country in the world has a poor class, and I think that is what he was referring to.

[Mr. William R. Lord]

By Mr. McQuarrie:

Q. We will go over it again. Why is it there are so many Japanese in the fishing industry in British Columbia?—A. I suppose because they are making a living at it.

Q. That is no answer to the question? Why is it the white men are not doing this work?—A. Because perhaps they don't want to.

Q. I am giving you an opportunity now of putting yourself right. Instead of doing that you start to hedge with me. That is not fair.

Mr. CLARK: You are doing all the talking.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I will withdraw from this Committee if there are going to be things fired at me like that. Give your opinion as to why there are so many Japanese fishermen instead of white men. This morning you made a statement which, as Mr. Clark said, might be misconstrued.—A. I suppose the reason there are not so many white men fishing, if they are of the same class as the certain few we have ourselves, I don't wonder at it; they don't go to work. They don't go to work at anything.

Q. Does that apply to the other districts as well?—A. No.

Q. You have told us you have been on the Fraser River for a long time.—A. I have been there since 1896, so I thought when you asked me that question you were referring to our own particular fishing ground.

Q. You say I am only interested in your own particular fishing ground.—A. Gill-net fishermen are different fishermen.

Q. I take exception to any statement made by anybody such as is made by Mr. Lord, because I am interested in the white fishermen, and I don't think the white fishermen come in the class such as he describes.

The CHAIRMAN: He has a right to give any answer he likes, and while you object that does not alter the fact he can make that answer.

By Mr. McQuarrie:

Q. Do you know whether it is a fact that the cannerymen prefer to have Japanese work for them in preference to white men.—A. No, I don't. I don't know how they stand as regards gill-net fishing at all. I know I would rather have white men fishing for me in the kind of fishing I do.

Q. Not over in your district?—A. Not the kind of men we have there, but real fishermen. There are a lot of good men on the West Coast. There are a few around Nootka Island.

By Mr. Clark:

Q. You have already told us you are employing more white men than Japanese?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Neill:

Q. Because you use seines?—A. Yes. No, Mr. McQuarrie I would not say anything like that generally, I was referring to a few men of the kind we have around our country.

The Committee adjourned until Wednesday, April 26, 1922, at 11 o'clock a.m.

COMMITTEE ROOM 429,
HOUSE OF COMMONS,
April 26, 1922.

The Select Standing Committee on Marine and Fisheries met at 11 o'clock a.m., the Chairman, Mr. Duff, presiding.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will please come to order. Mr. Clark, will you please read a resolution which was received by the Minister of Fisheries, and which was handed to me?

The CLERK: "Attached hereto is a copy of a resolution of the Army and Navy Veterans in Canada, with regard to fisheries policy in British Columbia.

It is the wish of the Association that this resolution should be placed before your Committee.

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) E. W. LAPOINTE."

RESOLUTION

Whereas out of a total of 2,714 Fishing Licenses issued for salmon fishing in the three principal rivers in the Province of British Columbia 1,917 are held by Japanese and a grand total of 3,276 Fishing Licenses have been issued by the Dominion Government to Japanese, and such licenses are renewed from year to year.

And whereas the salmon fishing industry in the Province of British Columbia has been steadily declining for several years last past.

And whereas by Order in Council the regulations in force prior to the year 1920 were changed.

And whereas immediate steps should be taken to protect the salmon fishing industry and conserve the same for Canadians to the exclusion of foreigners who in years past have exploited the industry and depleted the supply of fish.

The Army and Navy Veterans in Canada realizing the necessity for the conservation of fish and for the protection of white men now engaged in the industry, both Cannery men and Fishery men, recommend that the regulations now in force be immediately abolished and the regulations in force prior to the year 1920 be again made effective.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, gentlemen, unless some member of the Committee has something special to bring before the Committee I should like to swear Mr. Found.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I have here, Mr. Chairman, if you would allow me to read it, a memorandum which I have received from the Secretary of the British Columbia Fishermen's Protective Association—this is an organization of white fishermen—and also the Secretary of the Fraser River Fisheries Board. This latter organization is a fusion of all interests on the Fraser River for mutual protection, its object being primarily the welfare of the salmon fishing interests of the Fraser River, and, incidentally, the protection of the salmon as deemed necessary or prudent, encouragement of proper propagation of salmon, adequate protection of spawning areas and of fry, and careful study of salmon fisheries problems in all their ramifications, with a view to their sane solution. He says here that they have not had time yet to prepare a complete case, but here is generally what the fishermen want. He is not dealing here at all with the request which was made at the last meeting of this Committee by Mr. Lord in connection with the embargo on the export of raw salmon, because that has

not yet got to them; the fishermen do not know that matter is being taken up again since the decision of the Minister that nothing would be done this year, so that phase of the matter has not yet got before the fishermen. These are the matters dealt with:

"1. Elimination of Orientals from fishing industry in British Columbia. Their British naturalization is mere subterfuge to allow them to engage in fishing, as all are subject to recall for military service to Japan. They dominate the entrance to the South Arm of the Fraser and other strategic points in British Columbia.

"2. Abolition of traps and seines of all kinds. About the only plea the department puts forward against this is that it is not possible to catch fish in certain areas with gill nets and that the only traps now operating are 'competing' with American traps. All of which is fallacious. Of course it is impossible to catch fish in certain areas with gill nets, but let the gill nets operate where they should and the fish in those 'areas' will have to come there. This is not theory, but facts, easily recognized. This would cut down the areas through which the fish are now being 'more persistently pursued', as the department recently stated, and would result in surer seeding of natural spawning areas. As for traps competing with American traps, such is not the case. The interests operating these traps have a valuable concession that allows them to obtain large numbers of fish cheaper than their Canadian competitors. The only place any of them compete with the Americans is in the markets of the world. Don't imagine that the cheaper trap fish mean cheaper food for the public. Top price is always sought, as none of the canners ever exhibit symptoms of Carnegietis.

"3. One license for all British Columbia waters and use of gas boats wherever fishing is permitted. Now there are three Dominion licenses and one provincial. One Dominion license and one provincial are enough. That's \$15 for the right to work eight weeks and owe the cannery from \$14 to \$70, as many of the boys did last season in the North. It is contended by the department that the use of gas boats in the North would increase the price of fish to the public. The same argument was used with regard to the Fraser many years ago. Why would it increase the price of fish? Because the packers would have to install engines in their sail boats up North, it is said. We contend that the Fraser River fishermen would 'follow the fish' if he were given the chance. The fish run earlier in the North, and many would fish there and then return to the Fraser in time for the sockeye run here. They would use their own gas boats, thus would be independent fishermen in fact, instead of only in name, as at present. By what brand of lunatic logic does the department justify the practice of compelling men to risk their lives in sailboats in No. 3 District (North) and at the same time allows the use of steamboats with 50-horse-power engines to use seines and compete against these handicapped men? You might as well compel a group of men with wheelbarrows to compete with the freight trains of the C.N.R. You would demand service of them and yet would not let them use a motor car. Silly stuff. You want to build up a naval reserve, and yet you are handicapping the very life blood of what made the British Navy great during the recent war. As for the dearer salmon to the public. Forget it. Demand regulates the price along with supply, and the public will pay only so much anyway. Abolish trap and seines and let gas boats do their work, and the fish would be no dearer. We would then have a larger number of well paid men spending their money in the cities in the winter and fewer little groups of seiners going to California, where their money, earned in Canada, does the country no good.

"4. If not abolition of seines, then abolition of seining districts. There are 21 now, and it costs \$300 for a license in each and every one of them.

Result: Small operators frozen out by big ones. All returned soldiers who went into this game went broke, as I predicted beforehand. This is the biggest joke in Canada, outside of the tragic side of it. It is the most ghastly travesty ever perpetrated on the Coast.

"5. Abolition of cannery license fee of \$5 and substitution therefore of case tax that would be fair to all and would encourage groups of fishermen to can their own fish. This would give the smaller operator a fighting chance.

"6. More practical common sense in the care of salmon fry. Hatcheries obtain great results in number of eggs successfully hatched, but what good does that do when less than one-tenth of one per cent ever reach maturity? We want more study of the Oregon system. No departmental official or employee, up to last fall, has spent more than two days in acquiring knowledge that it took Clanton and his men from twelve to fourteen years to obtain, and they admit that they don't know it all yet. Would you call that good business. They should go through all the details of the work during the various seasons, when the food of the fish changes, and observe results. Many other business men with some basic knowledge are put in charge. You didn't hire a bricklayer to run the C.N.R. You got a railwayman. But who ever heard of a fisherman or a canner obtaining a responsible position in the fisheries department of British Columbia? But why haven't they? Not long ago the department was bragging about an invention of one of its minor officials. I wonder what the poor Scot who used it over seventy years ago would say were he alive. He were better dead, as he might choke to death.

Here we have an industry worth millions, and heretofore the mainstay of it has been the sockeye. They are the fish the government protected and propagated and they are the ones going headlong to extinction. In any other business what would have been done? Stock would be taken and sharp inquiry made into the causes by competent men with a view to remedial action. Would any other business have been allowed to run down hill on the same idiotic system? The answer is no. And this has gone on for twenty years. Cohoe, spring and dog salmon, all ardently fished for, are increasing in the Fraser river. So are the humpback salmon. Last year a department official said the government was going to protect the humps. An old fisherman fervently exclaimed: "God help the hump. He'll follow the sockeye now." The sockeye has the best chance to get up the river of any salmon. He comes in the freshet time, when the river is wider, deeper and swifter than at any other time and consequently harder to fish with gill nets. He can go under or around the nets. Yet he is on the wane. The coho for instance, which some twenty years ago was rarely caught in larger numbers than six or seven to a drift, comes when the river is low, often the nets reach almost from shore to shore and sweep the bottom in many places; and yet today he comes in myriads compared with twenty years ago. He has been spared the blessing of government protection and fostering care.

"7. A board in British Columbia to deal with fisheries problems and make recommendations to the Minister thereon. There has been such a board and was up to the outbreak of the war, but its activities were never such as to command any attention or support, and its prerogatives appear to have been usurped by one man. We want a board of practical British Columbia men. Then we will get some results, and I am sure that the pathway of the minister and his department would be much smoother and there would be more harmony all around.

"I wish that Fisheries Committee would come out to British Columbia and investigate where the investigating is good, and not diagnose the case by radio from a distance of three thousand miles."

The CHAIRMAN: Is that from one man or from a union of fishermen?

Mr. McQUARRIE: This is from the Secretary of the British Columbia Fishermen's Protective Association, and the same man is also secretary of what he calls the Fraser River Fisheries Board.

The CHAIRMAN: It represents the views of a number of people?

Mr. McQUARRIE: Of a number of fishermen there, yes. He has been in the business a very long time, and he is also a very strong man in the returned soldiers' organizations.

Mr. WARD: What is the nature of the meeting to-day, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN: Unless there is something special I thought we would call Mr. Found and get him to make a statement.

Mr. WARD: I have two matters that I have received recently from my constituents which I wish to read to this Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Go ahead and read them now.

Mr. WARD: You remember some statements I made the other day with reference to the American fishing companies fleecing the Government out of taxes. Since then I have received correspondence that bears out my remarks at the last meeting. This correspondence is, in part:—

"Smoked Goldeyes are as you say a delicacy, and already they are well introduced to the trade of Western Canada and sell to the consumers without difficulty. Their regular wholesale price to the retail trade is 20c. per pound—"

I might say, Mr. Chairman, that this is one of the best versed men in the fishing industry in Western Canada.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you object to giving his name?

Mr. WARD: I can give his name if you wish.

"20c. per pound f.o.b. Winnipeg, which is a nice price for fish. The fishermen get 2c. to 4c. per pound for them delivered at the lake shipping points—"

Those points are Winnepegosis and Mafeking.

"at the lake shipping points, the consumers pay 25c. to 30c. per pound for them smoked. Who is making the money out of those fish? United States capitalists, without a doubt.

"Our whitefish, just as they come from the fishermen without being smoked sell to the hotels and restaurants in the United States cities at 30 to 35 cents per pound without hesitation. Last winter our fishermen were paid 5c. to 6c. per pound for them delivered at the railway shipping points. The consumers in the United States cities pay 25c. per pound upwards for our pickerel, whereas last winter our fishermen received 4½c. to 5½c. per pound delivered at the railway shipping points for those fish. Who is making the intervening money? Nobody else than United States capitalists. What are those United States capitalists doing as well as fleecing our fishermen? They are also fleecing the Government out of payment of income tax, the method being that Chicago instructs their branches on our lakes here to bill out the fish to the parent houses in the United States at such low prices that it is impossible for the branches on our lakes here to do anything else than show losses on operations. Thus no profits are shown on operations on our lakes by the Booth Fisheries Canadian Co., Limited, and the Armstrong Independent Fisheries, Limited, and in consequence no income taxes can be collected from those institutions by the Government of the Dominion of Canada. Is it possible to conceive anything more ridiculous in one of the large industries of our country? United States capitalists are not content with fleecing Canadian fishermen, but also needs must fleece the Government of the Dominion of Canada.

"I quite agree with 'Bill' Duff of Lunenburg that hatcheries are useless, and it is a waste of money keeping them up. If the money so spent was used to control the marketing of our fish it would be spending the money in a practical way. The national debt of Canada will never be paid in any other way than by getting the money out of our natural resources. The money cannot be gotten out of our natural resources if we are going to continue to allow ourselves to be 'financially' annexed and skinned by United States capitalists."

I have further correspondence here that I received some time ago.

Re *Summer Fishing for Whitefish in Lake Winnipegosis*

I wish to acquaint you with all of the facts *re* the above. Since the year 1906 until this present year of 1921 lake Winnipegosis has been closed for summer fishing, it being illegal to take fish from the lake for commercial purposes. To suit the whim of Armstrong of Portage la Prairie this present year of 1921 it was made legal to take Whitefish from lake Winnipegosis for commercial purposes between the dates of June 1st until August 15th and Whitefish, Pickerel and Jackfish, and Mulletts, between the dates of September 1st and September 30th.

Now, it an utter impossibility to sell the Whitefish from lake Winnipegosis during the summer months. This was proven this past summer when the attempt was made to fish this lake and sell the fish. The reason why that it is impossible to make a success of the selling of summer produced Whitefish from lake Winnipegosis is that during summer lake Winnipeg can supply the markets with all the Whitefish the markets can use. In fact were all the Whitefish shipped from lake Winnipeg during summer fishing that could be shipped the markets would become flooded with those Whitefish. According to law 3,000,000 pounds of Dressed Whitefish is allowed to be taken from lake Winnipeg during summer fishing, June 1st until August 15th, and each and every summer of that 3,000,000 pounds 2,000,000 pounds has to be pan-frozen and held in storage for winter use. The markets simply cannot consume those fish as fast as the fishermen can produce them. Furthermore the quality of the Whitefish produced from lake Winnipeg is far superior to the quality of Whitefish produced from any other lake in Western Canada, and for this reason lake Winnipegosis Whitefish (unfrozen) will not sell on the markets in competition with Whitefish (unfrozen) from lake Winnipeg. During the summer months the Eastern Canadian markets obtain their Whitefish from lakes Nipigon and Nipissing, and the Western Canadian markets obtain their Whitefish from lake Winnipeg, and also does the United States markets obtain Whitefish from lake Winnipeg. The fact of the matter is that *nobody* can make a success of summer fishing lake Winnipegosis. When the attempt is made to fish the lake here the fishermen's time is wasted and also the fish are wasted.

During the month of September there is a certain demand for Pickerel for consumption by the Jewish people during their holidays pertaining to their New Year and Feast of the Tabernacle. But lake Winnipeg can supply that demand quite easily without lake Winnipegosis being Fall fished. When lake Winnipegosis is Fall fished the result is that on lake Winnipeg a large quantity of Pickerel is forced to be pan-frozen and held for winter consumption, because there is no freezing facilities here at Winnipegosis to amount to much, and the general result is that too much Pickerel is produced when the winter catch of weather frozen stock is added to the stocks of pan-frozen Pickerel in storage. The result of that is a crash in values of the frozen fish,

causing large losses to our fishermen and our country also in that we do not get proper values out of the frozen fish shipped to the United States during the winter season.

Now the Armstrong Independent Fisheries, Limited, and the Booth Fisheries Canadian Company, Limited, are both financed by capital from the United States. It can be said of the Booth Fisheries Canadian Company, Limited, that they are adverse to this summer fishing of lake Winnipegosis, but the head men of the Armstrong Independent Fisheries, Limited, in Chicago desire that lake Winnipegosis be open for summer fishing, so that they can fish the lake here in summer *if they want the fish*. The idea is that lake Winnipegosis be kept open for summer fishing so that it can be used as a club against lake Winnipeg to keep the price of lake Winnipeg Whitefish hammered down. If the fishermen on lake Winnipeg demand a fair price they are refused it, and the threat is made to them that if they do not accept what is offered them then lake Winnipegosis will be summer fished for Whitefish. In so far as Armstrong is concerned he is simply a salaried man, without a dollar of capital invested in the company bearing his name. He does not care a curse whether our fishermen are paid proper prices for the fish or not, nor does he care whether proper values for our fish come into Canada from the United States or not. Just so long as he can draw a large salary out of the fishing industry he is satisfied, and that is all he cares about.

The thing to be done with lake Winnipegosis is to close it for summer and fall fishing and fish it only during the winter season. If this is done the danger of an overproduction is removed, and a long step will be taken towards bringing into Canada from the United States proper values of our fish shipped to the latter country, and thus a step will be taken towards bringing our country back again to a prosperous condition.

Now, I wish to point out to you the method pursued by Armstrong, no doubt with Meighen's help, by which lake Winnipegosis became opened for this summer fishing. I was instrumental, after the Armstrong Independent Fisheries, Limited, had begun the construction of an icehouse at Whiskey Jack on the lake here, and they constructed this building and stocked it with ice previous to the opening of the lake for summer fishing, in drawing up a petition and getting it signed by over 150 fishermen against the opening of the lake for this summer fishing. This petition we sent to Bob Cruise, who placed it before the Department of Marine and Fisheries at Ottawa, and Mr. Cruise, who understands the matter in all its details, is strongly against the summer fishing of lake Winnipegosis, did his level best to prevent the lake from being opened for this summer fishing. Notwithstanding the petition, and notwithstanding Mr. Cruise's efforts, lake Winnipegosis was opened for summer fishing, and the results last summer proved disastrous. The method of opening it was as follows:—

Last spring, W. A. Found, the Assistant Deputy Minister of Fisheries, came here from Ottawa and called a fishermen's meeting about the opening of the lake. Only about a dozen fishermen attended the meeting; the ones who had signed the petition against the opening of the lake were so disgusted that they would not attend the meeting. These dozen or so fishermen are good producers of fish, but what they do not know about the marketing of fish would fill a large book. Several of these men are former residents of the Georgian Bay district. For years they dreamed here of the large quantities of fish they could catch in open water fishing, and they had the idea in their heads that thereby they could make a lot of money. They knew nothing about the selling of the product and did not understand that the fish could not be sold. These dozen or so men were unanimous in desiring that the lake be opened for summer fishing, and so an Order in Council was put

through opening up the lake. Now Armstrong has been doing business with these men for years. He understands them thoroughly and knew what their hopes were. It looks very much as if Armstrong, probably with Meighen's help, worked on these men here, through the Assistant Deputy Minister of Fisheries, W. A. Found, to get his way in the opening up of this lake Winnipegosis for summer fishing. It looks like a hoodwinking job on Armstrong's part from beginning to end.

Result, lake Winnipegosis is open for summer fishing and the fish cannot be sold.

It is to be hoped that you will bring this matter to the attention of the proper parties, and that the matter will be properly amended, that the lake be again closed for this open water fishing and fished in winter only.

The CHAIRMAN: I understood you to say, Mr. Ward, that you had no objection to giving the names of the men who wrote those letters.

Mr. WARD: W. B. Dempsey is the man's name.

Mr. BANCROFT: I would like, Mr. Chairman, to ask Mr. Ward a question. Does this man represent the fishermen, or whom is he supposed to represent?

Mr. WARD: He is a fisherman himself. He is a man who has fished in several waters in Canada, and has apparently made an exhaustive study of the marketing of fish. He was at one time head of a small company who organized themselves into a sort of selling agency in the village of Winnipegosis, and attempted to sell their own fish, but this is what they met: they would load a carload of fish, and the Armstrong Trading Company and the Booth Fisheries—practically the only two companies doing business in our inland waters of Canada, and having a monopoly of the business—would not make them a bid on their fish in Winnipegosis loaded on board the car. They would ship their fish to Chicago, and then of course the same company was there at Chicago, and as a result, because of these two companies, they got very little benefit after they paid the freight on their fish, and they were forced out of existence.

The CHAIRMAN: I did not notice that in either one of those letters the gentleman suggested a remedy for this condition.

Mr. WARD: He does suggest that summer fishing on lake Winnipegosis be closed. You understand, Mr. Chairman, that at lake Winnipegosis, at the village of Winnipegosis, they have a very poor train service. It is merely a spur which runs up there, and very often, even if they had the facilities, it would be of very little good to them, because there is not even a public dock at Winnipegosis. The facilities for loading fish are not good. Everything is adverse to summer fishing. I think it is not necessary for me to go into those. If Mr. Found was at Winnipegosis he would appreciate my remarks. There is no public dock there. I have applied to the Public Works to have a small dock built there, but there are no facilities there for shipping out the fish or loading them.

The CHAIRMAN: Since we are tabling correspondence, perhaps I had better read a letter which I received a few days ago, dated at Vancouver, April 19:—

"I have been much interested in your doings at Ottawa. I came to this coast from Campobello, N.S., where, for many years with Mr. Crother, I carried on a big fish business, general store, etc., until the American tariff on fish, lumber, potatoes, etc., shoved us to the wall. As the American tariff allowed fresh fish to go in American bottoms free, we could not run our fish stands, our market was in the States. Since October 1, 1913, a free market for Canadian fish has been, through President Wilson's administration, and now again the new Government of the States has a new tariff about ready, which is the highest tariff ever. And it allows fresh fish free entry when taken in by carriers or traders, fresh fish to benefit the wholesale fish dealers

and curers, but when fresh fish are frozen or packed in ice there is big duty to pay. Taking the near places to the fishing grounds of the Bay of Fundy, Tubec, East Port, Maine, where there are numbers of sardine factories, large fleets of boats go out and bring in the fresh fish from all kinds of fishermen on the Canadian side—herring, the small ones for making sardines and the larger ones for kippers, bloaters, haddock, cod and much pollack. A sardine factory means a plant where all kinds of fish are smoked, salted, canned and cured in every way. The duty on smoked has been \$20 per ton, when bought, has caused the smoked to be sold by the ton to the Americans, which gives employment during the winter months when the factories are closed to smoking sardines. The coming permanent tariff places \$50 per ton on boneless fish, which will hit Nova Scotia pretty hard. We need to get much herring from the Magdalene Islands, at our time there was not fishing all winter in the Bay of Fundy, but from 1872 until 1889 so much fishing was done there has not been a cargo of frozen got. During the winter of 1883, 104 cargoes of frozen was shipped in bulk to Boston and New York and 40,000 barrels were shipped from Eastport to the same markets. I believe very few if any large herring are now taken. Under the Washington Treaty, the States paid \$5,500,000 for the inshore fisheries or for the privilege of fishing in the waters of the British possessions in North America. I was among the first at halibut fishing on this coast, and we had the first steamer fishing from any port on the Continent of America and to-day there is not one boat fishing from Vancouver and the fisheries on the West Coast of Canada. British Columbia is almost wholly in the hands of Americans, who can send men from Seattle (a great fishing port) to Washington to make a high, or help make a high tariff against Canadian fish, a fleet of boats are engaged buying up all the fish taken by the Canadians and Japanese on our west coast taking these to the big dealers in Seattle. Some kinds that are now wanted by the Cannery are not allowed to be exported, the Sockeye Salmon, which is now almost extinct by our fishing and was at one time the only fish wanted. The New England Co., an American trust, has a monopoly of fish business in Vancouver, and has branches in several places on the coast. Most of the halibut are taken on the coast north of the International Line and south of Alaska. The N.E. Co. to do business in Canada, call a branch the Canadian Fishing Co., they have driven all the Canadian fishing companies and boats out, and now own their own steamers. Most of the Canadian fishermen who came from the Maritime Provinces and those from Newfoundland have gone to Seattle where they own many fishing boats and have driven the big companies' steamers out of business as they can't compete, there are so many dealers now and these companies do not have monopoly as they did. The Dominion Government has spent much money in protection of the deep sea fisheries, and is still, and gets nothing in return. On the Atlantic coast, \$5,500,000 was paid by the States and they gave a fur market for ten years, out here they have paid nothing, and now are to make or place the highest tariff ever. Under the treaty between the two countries, American fishing vessels are allowed to come in to buy wood and water, to repair damages, for shelter and for nothing else, whatsoever. As a war measure, Canadian fishing vessels were allowed to land fish in the States, this ceased on July 15, 1921, American vessels are now selling fish in Vancouver and ports on the west coast of Canada, and fish along the coast using Canadian harbours for base of operation and taking the money to their homes. Most of the fish taken into the big port of Ketchikan, Alaska, are from waters of British Columbia. A lot are landed in Prince Rupert. American vessels go there sometimes for bait but mostly because they can buy all kinds of liquor. The way the Government have handled the fisheries on this coast has caused Canadians to cross over to the state of Washington, until now there are nearly

100,000 born Canadians in Washington state alone, and in my own old home county of Charlotte, N.B., there are now less people or population than there were seventy-five years ago. These Japanese are a great menace, and I wish you would call on Mr. A. W. Neill, M.P., who will give you information. It is too bad if Americans can come and buy up our fish, and put a big tariff on them, when we ship them in packed in ice or frozen, etc. In 1910 the fisheries of Canada amounted to some \$25,000,000; in 1918 the fisheries of British Columbia alone amounted to more than \$25,000,000. At the same time nearly all the halibut on west coast of Canada are taken by American boats and go in reckoned as products of the American fisheries. We should never have given the Americans this privilege of shipping fish inland through Canada. Canadian fishing vessels never go in American waters on the Pacific coast to do any fishing for there are not any fish in American waters to catch. American purse seines are destroying the fish on our coast. American owned fishing boats of Canadian register should not be allowed to fish in Canadian waters on the Pacific coast, Canadians are not allowed to operate American boats. The Gt. Pacific R. Road own an American steamer boat to carry freight from Alaska, for the railroad out of Prince Rupert but can't use her now, and is at the dock for nearly two years idle. Why does not the Government cut out the Order in Council, allowing American fishing great privileges, then the American fishing vessels would become Canadian. After the Civil War, 1861-65, Canadians went in streams to the States. Wages were good, manufacturing plants were going on every side all over the New England States, but on the Pacific coast the fisheries is the cause of so many leaving for the States. A license fee of \$500 is charged by both provincial government for a cannery. Japanese have been brought in who live in villages about the canneries, where they have large families and soon will overrun the country. Exportation of fresh fish would if prohibited be the cause of the Canadian canning houses. Wholesale fish houses would start up, the States must have the fish for food, and the consumer would pay the duty. More than 50 per cent of the fish dealers and cannery men on the American side are born Canadians. And most of the deep sea fishermen are Canadians, Newfoundlanders and Scandinavians who with their families form a great part of the population of the state of Washington. The Government granted licenses to the American trust who own more than \$100,000 worth of gasoline boats, seines and supply bait, until our own herring fishermen have had to give up, leave their Canadian homes and go to the American side or find other employment. Purse seines if allowed to continue will destroy all salmon and herring. The past winter some 300,000 barrels of herring was taken in seines made of netting brought over from Japan, and salt from California, and packed in rough boxes made in Japanese mills. The Japanese own all the sein boats and seines, and hire the white men paying \$3 for catching the herring. Many vessels from the American side go to the cod banks of Behring sea and bring cargoes which are dried and which now goes to the same markets as your Nova Scotia cod go.

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) C. F. BATSON,
522 Richards Street.

Prof. Prince will tell you who I am.

Mr. NEILL: As regards the remark that I can furnish you with information, I have, I suppose, thirty or forty letters similar in extent to that which I would be very happy to bring down and read.

Mr. McQUARRIE: From the same man?

Mr. NEILL: From the same man, and cover as great an area, and in some instances a greater, of time and material.

The CHAIRMAN: I suppose that covers it pretty well.

Mr. NEILL: That only touches the fringe of the information.

The CHAIRMAN: If there are no other comments by members of the Committee we will ask Mr. Found to make a statement.

W. A. FOUND, sworn.

WITNESS: After the rather severe indictments to which you have listened, were it not for a feeling of confidence that if the Committee would feel it worth while to go into these various matters in detail they can all be answered to its satisfaction, I would hesitate to appear before you at all. Needless to say, if I should start with the last first, in the letters that were read by Mr. Ward there were not very many lines read before I knew the writer. I would only like to say in the first place, if the correspondent has in mind that United States concerns who are doing the commercial end of the business are not being taxed heavily enough, I have nothing to say. That is a matter that may be very well worth following. When, however, it comes to the matter of the condition of the fisheries of Lake Winnipeg and Lake Winnipegosis, I can speak with some authority, and I shall be very glad to call upon the fishermen of these lakes to bear evidence to the correctness of what I say. There is no question that a number of years ago Lake Winnipeg was in a very serious condition, as well as Lake Winnipegosis. Regulations that were regarded as of an adequate character were adopted and enforced as well as might be, and a vigorous hatchery policy was entered into. The result has been that to-day the fisheries of Lake Winnipeg are, I think I can state without any fear of contradiction, in as good a condition as they ever were, that the fishermen are making as good catches individually as they were in the palmy days of the fishery. Last year, after the regulations having been enforced for quite a number of years, there were several requests for their amendment. Before dealing finally with them, it was considered well to call meetings of all interested. To that end I went to the district last June. After well advertising the meetings, a meeting in Winnipeg, which was representative of the fishermen of Lake Winnipeg, went over the situation. It was a well-attended meeting. The evidence of the fishermen, I think, without any division of opinion, was that they had no criticisms to make of the condition of the fisheries, but that the regulations had to be made from the standpoint of enabling the fishermen to sell their catches to the best advantage. I went on then to Winnipegosis, because the Winnipegosis men could not very well come to Winnipeg. Mr. Dempsey was not at either of those meetings, although he was well advised of them; that is, he had the same advice that everyone else had, which was several weeks' notice given broadcast, and I took pains to have them sent out in every fishing district. I do not know whether Mr. Ward knows the whole situation at Winnipegosis, but it was fairly full of fishermen who came from the north end of the lake to especially attend that meeting. The recommendations that were made were the recommendations of that meeting, which consisted mainly of the fishermen of that district, and I venture to say that these regulations will receive the endorsement of the great majority of fishermen of Lake Winnipegosis to-day.

By Mr. Ward:

Q. You are dealing with the summer fishing now?—A. Yes, I am dealing with the summer fishing now, unless in the light of the experience they have changed their view. That may be, but I do make the statement that the conclusions reached were not my sum-up, because I was careful to get the resolution before the meeting

[Mr. W. A. Found]

and get their vote on it. I think if there is nothing further that you want to hear from that standpoint, we might move to the British Columbia end of it.

Mr. WARD: I should like to inform Mr. Found of something. I think I am speaking for the fishermen of Lake Winnipegosis; I know them very well; they just live forty miles from my home, and we occasionally go there for a holiday. However, the experience, I am quite sure, of the majority of the fishermen is that summer fishing was not a success last summer. As this letter states, the pan-freezing facilities are very inadequate there, and I might tell you, Mr. Chairman, although I did not see this myself—I have it from residents of Winnipegosis—that the little sews they have there were taken across the bay and the fish forked out into the weeds and grass along the edge of the lake, and they could not dispose of them. That was the result of summer fishing.

WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, I think that I need not appeal to any one who will understand that situation better than you, or any other man who was in the fishing business last summer, and I would think that I will have the endorsement of those engaging in the fish business when I state that last summer should not be accepted as a criterion of what the marketing conditions for fish will be. I do not know whether the member is cognizant of the fact or not, but the fact remains that the cold storage plants of Manitoba, as well as the cold storage plants of Chicago and St. Paul were practically full of fish at the beginning of last season that were carried over from the season before, on account of the over-production. That had to be met with; normality had to be got back to, and last year was a very, very hard year. I would not like to say that because the fishermen did not make a satisfactory season last year that is a condemnation of summer fishing in lake Winnipegosis. Certainly summer fishing in lake Winnipeg has been a splendid thing to the fishermen, and the great majority of them want it. If they cannot sell their fish, of course we do not want the fish to be caught and we do not want them to be losing time, but if they can it is certainly in their interest to let them. When you come to the question of the prices of fish paid by the consumer in the West as compared with that received by the fishermen, you are of course raising another great big question. One thing the Department has sought to provide against at all times is difficulty on the part of the Canadian dealers in getting all the fish they want for the Canadian markets. If after that is done you are going to object to the exportation of fish, I find it very hard to see why you will not object to the exportation of wheat, for instance, why you are not going to let a fisherman be a man working for a living as well as anybody else; he has got to get a market for his fish, and the market does not exist in the West. If fishing is going to be carried on as an industry it must be gone on with mainly by supplying foreign markets. That condition exists all over Canada.

By Mr. Bancroft:

Q. There has been some mention of lake Winnipeg; it is in the constituency of Selkirk, which I have the honour to represent. There seems to be considerable dissatisfaction there about the size of mesh used, and it seems that is a recent regulation. It has been changed recently to a four and a half inch mesh. Was that taken up at the Winnipeg meeting?—A. Yes; the meshes were settled in conformity with the resolutions of the people. The mesh was reduced from five and a half for whitefish to five and a quarter. The same mesh for pickerel in lake Winnipeg was left as it was before. The majority of the people want it. Now, there is some difference of opinion there, Mr. Bancroft, but the majority of the people at that time at least, and I think the condition of the fishery and the catches they are making, all indicate the reasonable condition of the existing regulations. I would only like to add what I intended to add there, that to the members of this committee who have any doubt as to the wisdom of fish culture, in keeping up the fisheries, I would like them to get

[Mr. W. A. Found]

the evidence of the Winnipeg fishermen themselves. I have got no stronger endorsements most places from what results from a fish culture than in that very district.

By the Chairman:

Q. Have you a copy of the evidence on the resolutions?—A. I have got a copy of these on file. I am speaking entirely from memory and subject to very minor corrections. I know that I am stating in substance the facts.

Mr. BANCROFT: Mr. Chairman, if I am allowed, I might state right here that as far as my own experience goes I have never heard any objections to the artificial hatcheries in lake Winnipeg—I think there are three of them there—and until I came here I never heard anything against the idea of artificial hatcheries.

WITNESS: On the contrary, you will get testimony running the other way very very strongly.

By Mr. Neill:

Q. Salmon?—A. Those are dealing with whitefish mainly.

Mr. WARD: Mr. Chairman, do you not think that it would be possible in some way to regulate the system? As I pointed out in the House the other night, the system is that the company that buys the fish at Winnepegosis is the same company that buys them in Chicago. It seems that there is something wrong there. Every fishing facility in Winnepegosis is controlled by those two companies, the Armstrong and the Booth Fisheries. That is, they own the facilities, and they lease them or sell them to the fishermen. When the fish are produced they dispose of them in the Booth Fisheries or the Armstrong Fish Company. Those are the only existing agencies they sell fish to or do business with. In Chicago or any other American market the very same thing prevails.

The CHAIRMAN: Well, Mr. Ward, suppose the Department passed a regulation to prevent the American buyers or the American capital from buying fish, what would happen then?

Mr. WARD: Mr. Chairman, I frankly admit that I am not suggesting—

The CHAIRMAN: I am just trying to get some idea.

Mr. WARD: The fisherman does not seem to be——

The CHAIRMAN: Give us some reason for curing it.

Mr. WARD: I was on Lake Winnepegosis last winter myself, and I saw fish piled up there in windrows almost, myself, and boxed up, they were worth one cent and a half a pound.

Mr. MORRISSEY: Can you suggest a remedy?

Mr. WARD: Jackfish was selling in Winnipeg for seven and a half cents a pound.

WITNESS: But would you follow the difference?

Mr. WARD: I am merely suggesting this for the benefit of the Department. I am just telling you that jackfish at the very same time that the men were getting a cent and a half boxed up at Winnepegosis were selling for twelve cents in Winnipeg, and whitefish were selling at eighteen and twenty cents in Winnipeg when they were getting five and five and a half. There is a discrepancy there.

WITNESS: There is possibly too great a spread in the price of fish, but the member knows that these are conditions over which we have no control. There is no absence of competition.

Mr. WARD: That is just all I want to know, if it cannot be remedied by the Department, that is what I want to be able to tell my people.

WITNESS: If a retail dealer is handling fish from a certain standpoint and handling a small quantity, he has to sell it at a certain price. In any event you are coming into the question of property and civil rights, and I am afraid that is something we cannot touch.

[Mr. W. A. Fould]

MR. BANCROFT: Mr. Chairman, I think that is the real difficulty with the fishermen. We admit we are dependent on the American market for the sale of this fish, and the problem of marketing seems to be the most serious problem.

WITNESS: It is everywhere. Our member here will tell you what the fishermen on the Atlantic coast are getting for cod and haddock. You know what you pay for cod and haddock if you go down here, with only the Atlantic coast between us and production. One of the things, the initial difficulty, is that the bigger the demand the cheaper the fish gets; the more a man handles the more cheaply he can handle it, and the more cheaply he can transport it. It is the initial end of it.

MR. BANCROFT: I think that is where the big difficulty is.

WITNESS: Yes, it is. It is the thing itself, apart from the fishery altogether.

By Mr. Elliott:

Q. Did you ever have this spread investigated to find out where it goes?—A. It has been the subject of an investigation by this Committee, and there is a big volume of evidence on it.

MR. ELLIOTT: Because I might say, as representing a district that is far inland, we thought that in view of the fact that the fishermen get a very low price for their produce and we pay a tremendously high price, someone is getting a good big rake-off for the whole transaction.

WITNESS: Superficially it looks that way. I have forgotten the year the evidence was taken, but Mr. Howe will be able to tell you. The evidence has been printed and will be available.

By Mr. Ward:

Q. Have the department ever thought of developing either the goldeye or the tulibee industry, as I suggested the other day, and placing it on the market as a delicacy? That has been a subject of discussion among the fishermen for several years, that both the tulibee and the goldeye industry could be developed. They are a very delicate fish, but they are quite plentiful in those lakes. They might be developed and placed on the market as a smoked fish, and might be sold in the American market at a good price.—A. The tulibee and goldeye on the market as smoked fish is now a very important business. That method is not new. When they come on the markets they have to compete with somewhat similar fish, when they leave certain markets such as the kippered herring, and as a usual thing they do not seem to stand up to the competition. I do not want to go too far into that. I think there is a good deal can be done there, and a good deal is being done, but that market is being cultivated by some of the biggest dealers in this country, as rapidly as they can cultivate it, and you see the results, in the quantities that are being handled as compared with the quantities that were being handled a number of years ago. Tulibee and goldeye are somewhat kindred to the fresh-water herring, not as good a variety, and are good only a short time in the year.

Q. On completion of this investigation you speak of you will advise the fishermen, will you, of the result of this investigation you are making? You have said that you are making an investigation—A. No, no; I said that the matter of the spread of price in fish was a matter of investigation by the Marine and Fisheries Department of this House some parliments ago.

The CHAIRMAN: 1912 or 1913, I think it was.

By Mr. Ward:

Q. What was the decision of that?—A. They made certain recommendations along lines that we had been following. Our department has been doing a great deal in years gone by to develop the demand for fish in the way of assisting in transportation charges and so forth. From that direction, it dropped in 1919, feeling that the

[Mr. W. A. Found]

business had reached the point where it could stand on its own feet. It is still doing a great deal in the way of publicity.

Q. Will you say, Mr. Found, that you think the Canadian Government is getting all out of the Canadian fisheries that it is possible to get out of them?—A. Absolutely not.

Q. That is the point. The point is this: when we look up the records of the value of our Canadian fish, the amount of Canadian fish that is shipped out of Canada, and then look up what the Government is getting out of it, there seems to be discrepancy there.—A. You mean, the Government is not getting the revenue out of it?

Q. Yes; surely our Government ought to be able to get what is coming to it out of this fish industry. We are spending a lot of money on hatcheries, and so on.—A. As I understand, what you have in mind now is a business tax on these people doing business there. When I said "Absolutely not" I did not understand the question.

Mr. WARD: Mr. Chairman, it is deplorable that with the value of fish that is shipped out of Canada the Canadian Government or the Canadian people receive so little in return for the huge value of fish that is shipped out of Canada.

The CHAIRMAN: They get paid for the fish that goes out.

Mr. WARD: Yes, but not very much. The point is this the American companies buy this fish at the point of production for from a cent and a half to six and a half cents a pound, which was the maximum last year. When we consider the price that this fish sells for in the American market, it seems that we are not getting enough. In what way do these American companies get privileged to do business with our Canadian fishermen?

Mr. MORRISSEY: Down home if the Americans were not allowed in to buy our fish we would starve to death.

WITNESS: It is not a fishery matter at all.

Mr. WARD: I do not wish to exclude them.

WITNESS: We license the fishermen to fish. After he gets the fish he sells them as he thinks fit and to whom he thinks fit. The American is rarely a buyer.

By Mr. Ward:

Q. They just come in and buy?—A. That is it.

By Mr. Bancroft:

Q. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask one more question about the size of mesh. Are the rules regarding that very strict? Are they strictly enforced?—A. As strictly as we can, sir.

Mr. BANCROFT: I understood they were allowed some changes during the election campaign, and perhaps it was the idea that if some particular size of mesh was good for election it might be good for other purposes.

WITNESS: We have a pretty good organization on the lakes at the present time, and I think that if you will investigate it it will be found to be functioning pretty fairly well.

The CLERK: Mr. Chairman, may I ask Mr. Found a question?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

By the Clerk:

Q. Do you refer to the evidence taken on the Marine and Fisheries Committee with Mr. Jameson as Chairman?—A. Yes.

The CLERK: That is in printed form. There are several thousand copies in cold storage, and anyone who wants it may have it.

The CHAIRMAN: I would suggest that you get the copies, Mr. Howe, from wherever they are and distribute them among the members.

[Mr. W. A. Found]

WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, I am not clear, in view of the way this matter was approached, what is expected or desired of me as far as British Columbia is concerned.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I thought possibly you might take up the Fraser River first, Mr. Found, and I would suggest that you give the Committee some idea of conditions on the Fraser River, comparing conditions of today with say the conditions in 1901.

Mr. JOHNSON: May I make a suggestion in the meantime, Mr. Chairman? Mr. Duff put a communication on the record here which dealt very considerably with the privileges that we are extending to the United States men in British Columbia ports. We have been doing that for a great many years. The communication has been placed upon the record taking exception to that, and I am not so sure that it would not be wise to have something immediately following the insertion in the record of that communication, because I have a sort of an idea that it will not be the general view in British Columbia that these privileges to which exceptions are taken should be withdrawn. Mr. Stork is not here today. I am pretty sure that he would object to these privileges being withdrawn.

Mr. McQUARRIE: That is, the privileges of American buyers buying our fish?

Mr. JOHNSON: And American vessels coming into our waters, etc., etc. That is, as I understand it, what this communication here is taking exception to.

The CHAIRMAN: It might be as well to deal with that just as we dealt with other letters.

Mr. McQUARRIE: We could go on with communications dealt with this morning.

The CHAIRMAN: We have dealt with the other communications now; this is the only one remaining.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I am satisfied with any mode of procedure that is agreeable.

Mr. NEILL: Well, Mr. Stork is not here; it might be well to avoid it.

Mr. JOHNSON: There is no exception, of course, on the part of British Columbia to the observations contained in this communication.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Mr. Chairman, as far as this communication is concerned, I happen to know Mr. Batson, and I would say frankly that I do not think that Mr. Batson represents the fishing interests of British Columbia in any way, or can express to this Committee the views held by any of the interests, either the fishery, the cannery men, or anybody connected with it. I do not think that the communication is one that we should waste very much time with at the present time. I state that frankly for the information of this Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: All right.

WITNESS: It is well stated, too.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I put it as Mr. Neill suggests, that this communication could be more profitably dealt with at a later time.

The CHAIRMAN: Place it on file.

The WITNESS: As the members of the Committee generally are not very familiar with the salmon fishery of British Columbia, I take it, it may be of greatest value to spend two or three minutes in just describing what that great fishery consists of. In dealing with the Fraser River, so far as the salmon fishery is concerned, you are dealing with that which is incident to the whole coast of British Columbia. There are five species of salmon on the Pacific coast; commercially speaking, there are six. That is, in their present commercial order of value, the sockeye, the highly red fish, firm and oily in its nature; it is followed by the spring salmon, the largest of the varieties; then there is the coho, which is also highly coloured, splendid in flavour, high quality; then comes the pink, the smallest of the British Columbia fish, very good in quality, colour not so high, but of splendid food value, and the lowest in commercial quality is the chum, or, as it is commonly called, the dog salmon, a splendid

[Mr. W. A. Found]

fish for food purposes, a good canning fish, but falls off considerably in its colour when it is canned, so that up to the present time the demand for it has not been as great as for any of the others, and not as great, as a general thing, as the supply. These fish all die after spawning, so that you have that clear issue to keep in mind, that these fish spawn once and die. We catch them coming in from the sea to spawn, so that the time when they are caught is comparatively short. They are all what is known as anadromous fish, that reach their maturity and growth in the sea, but have to get back to the fresh waters of the rivers and lakes to reproduce. They stay in the rivers and lakes different periods. The Fraser River, as you will see by a glance at the map, is potentially the greatest salmon river on the Pacific coast—and that means in the world. It drains, I think, speaking from memory, over ninety thousand square miles of territory. What makes it so capable from a salmon-reproducing standpoint is the tremendous area of spawning ground that is tributary to it. The fishing in the Fraser began commercially about 1876. One other point that I should have stated to make the whole matter clear is that in connection with this salmon—in fact, with all salmon—what is known as the homing theory has now been practically vindicated beyond reasonable doubt; that is, that the fish not only come back to the area in which they were hatched, to the river in which they were hatched, but very largely to the tributary stream in which they were hatched.

By Mr. Grimmer:

Q. Have they demonstrated that on the Atlantic too?—A. That has not been demonstrated to such a great extent on the Atlantic, but the evidence that way tends to confirm the correctness of it there. On the Pacific coast now there is not very much doubt about it. Therefore you will see that not only each stream is its own problem, but each tributary of each stream becomes a particular problem, and if you are going to maintain a system of fisheries you have to maintain the whole of that river system.

By Mr. Neill:

Q. If that roe is transported to another river, will they go back to the river in which they were originally bred?—A. The river in which it was hatched. The experience shows that there is very little doubt that if you stock a river the fry from that river come back to that river, not to where the eggs came from. It is a matter, no doubt, of instinct, coming back to the waters in which they were originally brought up.

Q. That is established, is it?—A. I would not say that it is absolutely established, but the information, I think, that we have is so confirmatory that I know of no authority that takes a contrary view. We have in the Fraser River a very peculiar phenomenon, known nowhere else; that is, a tremendous run every fourth year, followed by three off years. That existed as far back as the historical record goes. A great big run every fourth year is followed by three smaller ones. For instance, 1921, 1917, 1913—which was, as I will show you in a moment, the last big year. The causes for that we can only conjecture. It is probably that it was due to a slide from the mountain into Hell's Gate canyon in the very early times. The rapids and falls up, which these fish go is astonishing, in making their way up to the spawning grounds. About 125 miles up the river there is a great canyon; I do not remember how wide it is, but I think at its narrowest point it is not more than about 70 feet wide, and through that the whole Fraser river is forced to pass, between walls of rock. That is known as Hell's Gate, and has always been a difficult place. It is quite probable that in the early days a slide came down into that narrow passage which blocked the ascent of fish entirely the year in which it came, very largely the second year when some of it would be washed out, less the next year, and by the fourth year that nature had washed it all out again. That seems to be a reasonable explanation of a big fourth year and three small years, backed up by the fact that in the big year

[Mr. W. A. Fould]

alone the spawning ground above Hell's Gate was peopled with salmon in a large way. They were in those big years in the past as thick in those upper waters as in the others. In the off years there was not very much difference from one year to the other as to the number of fish going to the spawning grounds below Hell's Gate. About 1876 salmon fishing began commercially on the Fraser. There was none being done at that time on the United States side, and none for some years afterwards. Fishing was not carried on very largely on the Fraser then. Somewhere around 1890, I think, the fishing extended out from the mouth of the Fraser into the Gulf of Georgia here (Indicating on map.) They came along first this portion of the river, and they got out then into the Gulf of Georgia. The next year, 1891, they began to take the fish coming in here, and about 1897 the American industry came into full swing. It should be stated, to make it quite clear, that the fish entering the Fraser—if not all, practically all—come in through Juan de Fuca Strait here, evidently coming in pretty well all over the strait, and when they pass the southern end of Vancouver Island they make their way across and come down this side. The waters of the Fraser river come down here; those of you who have been there no doubt have noticed that as soon as you get to this point you can see the muddy waters of the Fraser river. They come up here, and do not emerge from the United States waters again until just about the boundary line. The traps began to be fished in the United States about 1897 among these islands here, great numbers of them.

By Mr. Grimmer:

Q. What do you call traps? Are they what we call weirs?—A. Your weirs are babies. That method of fishing is by great big things that sometimes run up in cost of construction to twenty or twenty-five thousand dollars, I should say.

By Mr. McQuarrie:

Q. Piles are put in, are they not?—A. Piles driven down, out for a long distance.

By the Chairman:

Q. How long are they, do you know?—A. The leaders are restricted; 2,400 feet, I think, is the limitation amongst these islands.

By Mr. McQuarrie:

Q. They are very extensive, these traps, are they not, very numerous, and cover a lot of land—or perhaps I should say a lot of water?—A. They began about 1897, and from then you begin to see the effects on the off years. Then came the United States seines, the big purse seines, followed by traps. They had these two apparatuses following the fish in the United States waters before the fish emerged to the Fraser waters.

By Mr. Elliott:

Mr. Found, these traps were set in United States waters, on American territory? A.—Yes.

By Mr. Grimmer:

Q. That is out of the three-mile limit?—A. Yes, well out of the Strait of Fuca and the Gulf of Georgia, one side of which is Canada and the other side United States. They were on the United States side of the line. They were set mainly in Puget Sound.

Q. Is that territorial water?—A. It is territorial water, and these traps are set close in to the shore of the islands.

Mr. McQUARRIE: On the mainland too; take at Point Roberts, there are a great many traps at Point Roberts.

The CHAIRMAN: The leader goes right to the shore.

WITNESS: The leader is fastened to the piles. That was the main fishing ground of the trap. That is where the traps were doing their greatest amount of havoc.

[Mr. W. A. Found]

Mr. McQUARRIE: It struck me that the Committee might not understand the extent of these traps.

WITNESS: The number of them that were there in the big years I would not like to say. I would state, subject to correction, that there would not be less than two hundred, and might be very considerably more. The number of licenses that were taken out was nearer six hundred, on the United States side, but the license does not indicate the number fished.

By Mr. McQuarrie:

Q. Would you have any general idea as to the number of fish that would be caught in those traps in a good year?—A. Well, I can give you the packs that were put up on the United States side and the Canadian side. As I said, in 1897 the Americans came into the fishery in earnest. It was from then that you began to see the failure of the off years, that is, that the run of fish—when the spawning was potentially smaller—could not stand the onslaught that was being made on them from both sides of the line. The big years having such tremendous runs seemed unaffected even by the tremendous fishing that was carried on, the quantities were so great.

Q. Have you the packs?—A. I have the packs.

Q. We might put them in.—A. Here they are. I am giving you the pack of sockeye salmon alone. It would not be fair to take the other varieties, as Mr. McQuarrie and Mr. Neill know that there was not a demand for some of the other species, and they were not packed to any extent for quite a number of years afterwards. Therefore it would not be a safe criterion to take any but the sockeye. The sockeye pack in 1897 on the Canadian side was 860,459 cases.

Q. Is that the Fraser River?—A. That is the Fraser River. On the United States side that year, 312,048 cases, or a total of 1,172,507.

Q. That would be fish that came from the Fraser River in both cases?—A. They were hatched in the Fraser River, yes. Four years later, the next big year, 1901, you will see how the figures began to reverse themselves. Our pack was 928,669 cases, and the pack on the United States side was 1,105,096 cases, or a total of 2,033,765 cases. Four years later, in 1905, the next big year, our pack was 837,489 cases, their pack was 847,122 cases, a total of 1,684,611 cases. Four years later, in 1909, our pack was 585,435 cases, their pack was 1,005,120 cases, a total of 1,590,555 cases.

By Mr. Neill:

Q. Their catch was double ours?—A. Yes. Four years later, which I will show you in a moment, was the last big year, 1913; our pack was 736,661 cases, their pack was 1,664,827, or a total of 2,401,488 cases.

By Mr. McQuarrie:

Q. Could you go right on with the figures up to date?—A. The next cycle, 1917, the pack was on the Canadian side 148,164 cases, on the United States side 411,538 cases, a total of 559,702 cases. Last year, which was the cycle at that year again, these fish being four-year fish, our pack is 35,900 cases; their pack I give you as an estimate, as I have not got their final figures, about 76,000 cases, a total of 111,900 cases.

Mr. GRIMMER: It has fallen off, hasn't it?

The CHAIRMAN: Right here, would it be as well now we have the information, to give us some idea of the number of fishermen fishing in those different years.

Q. Were there as many fishermen fishing in 1921 as there were in 1917, for instance? Is the catch due to the depreciation in the fish, or to the difference in the number of fishermen?—A. The catch since 1913 is, of course, due to the fishery. Prior to that time the number of fishermen would scarcely be a criterion, because on the United States side the fish were caught nearly altogether in traps and purse seines.

[Mr. W. A. Fould]

Our number of fishermen of course was very large. We had in some of these big years as many as 3,200 licenses in the Fraser River.

Q. What about last year? How does that year, as far as the Canadian fishermen are concerned, compare with 1917 and 1913?—A. I would say, subject to correction, that there would not be more than about 1,200 fishermen last year in the Fraser River.

Q. And how many the fourth year previous to that, 1917?—A. 1917, there would be more; possibly 1,800 or thereabout.

By Mr. McQuarrie:

Q. But you can state this, that the number of fishermen did not have anything to do with the difference in the amount of the catch?—A. Absolutely nothing at all; I will explain that in one moment.

By Mr. Neill:

Q. Did the smaller years depreciate in the same ratio as the other years?—A. The smaller years began to go down in 1897. When the United States got into the industry in a big way the figures began to go right down. For instance, in 1898 the total catch was 508,101—I mean the total pack of sockeyes; that is American and Canadian. In 1902 it was 633,033, somewhat bigger. In 1906, 365,248; I am giving you the biggest year of the three off years. They were running down. For instance, the next year was 159,591; the next year to that, 229,792, and I think that is sufficient to give you an indication of how it was going.

Q. When it came to be a great big drop—1913, was it as bad then?—A. 554,434; the next year, 155,714; the next year, 105,870; and last year, 107,252.

By Mr. McQuarrie:

Q. What is the document you are reading from?—A. I am reading from a provincial report, which I just picked up this morning, assuming that the figures are correct. I had the other figures filed myself up to three years ago.

Q. I was wondering if you would file that report?—A. I will file that page; I can file the whole report, as far as that is concerned.

By Mr. Grimmer:

Q. Your contention is that the waters are overfished?—A. No doubt about it at all.

By Mr. McQuarrie:

Q. Just the reverse; you are not saying they are over-fished at all?—A. I certainly would not say that anything else is the case.

MR. NEILL: Over trapped.

WITNESS: Well, that is over-fished. I say that these fisheries were being over-fished, overdone. In 1913, the last big—

By Mr. McQuarrie:

Q. But that is not by the number of fishermen; you do not mean to say that the number of fishermen was responsible for the diminution in the amount of fish caught?—A. Well, I do not want to be diverted too much from that line, but it is no use for this Committee to not face all the issue so far as the Fraser River is concerned. There is no area in my knowledge that has been fished as heavily, or anything like as heavily as the Canadian portion of the Fraser River. It has been extremely heavily fished, and why should we prevent that being done when the United States, having the first go at the fish all the way along, were using no discretion and would not join in efforts with us? But when you consider 3,200 nets in about 15 miles of river, each net about 150 fathoms long, and figure that down to a square mile, you begin to see whether the river is being heavily fished or not. We must look at it from both stand-points. That whole area was too heavily fished on both sides.

[Mr. W. A. Found]

By Mr. Neill:

Q. But only when the traps began did it show any drop?—A. Only when the traps began did it show any drop; there was not the heavy prosecution till that time.

Mr. BANCROFT: Mr. Chairman, has this department ever approached the United States with a view to arriving at some arrangement in that regard?

WITNESS: I will come to that in about two minutes, Mr. Bancroft. In 1913, the last big year, it happened that the C.N.R. was being built along the side of Hell's Gate. The blast from the sides of that great chasm, the substance, the material, went down into the canyon. No fisheries expert or engineer, or any man that I ever met, would have said that it was going to do any damage by looking at it, but the result was that it broke the little sheltering eddy in which the fish were able to take a rest in making that heavy passage through that channel, so that they could not do it, and very few fish got above Hell's Gate in that year. We went to work at once and made some temporary arrangements as soon as we found that they were not able to get up, and some got up; but to all intents and purposes the upper waters of the Fraser River were not restocked that year. The result was that 1917 got down to the basis of a good off year, and 1921 has been less than 1917. So that we have now, regrettably, passed the time when there is one big year in the four to hold on to in the Fraser River, and an asset which had a value of at least, from the sockeye alone, thirty million dollars to this continent, of which twelve million dollars annually should be to Canada at least, is approaching the vanishing point. Seeing that the matter could not be dealt with by Canada alone, regardless of the fact that we had all the spawning areas, the matter was taken up with the United States a number of years ago.

By Mr. McQuarrie:

Q. When was that, do you know?—A. It resulted in a treaty in 1908. It would be some years before that that the first negotiations began. That treaty was ratified by the United States Senate, and provided—

Q. Have you got that treaty?—A. I have not a copy with me. I will place it before the Committee. That treaty provided for the appointment of a commission to make regulations. It was our general understanding at the time that these regulations when made would come into force. It developed however, that when the regulations were made by the Commissioners they had to run in the United States the same course as the treaty itself. That is, they had to receive the approval of the United States Senate, and they failed to receive that approval, and after a number of years of trying to drive the issue Canada finally, in 1914, I think, resumed liberty of action under the treaty and dropped the matter for the time.

Q. Could you give us a general idea of the nature of those regulations?—A. I will file a copy of these regulations with the treaty. You see, the Fraser river was only a part. That was a boundary waters fisheries treaty, and as I have not looked them over I would not like to start to quote them at the moment.

Q. They would consist, I presume, of some regulations which would restrict to a certain extent the operation of traps?—A. These regulations were to bear on both sides, and were put in force by the federal governments of both sides. Let it be understood that in the States the fisheries administration comes within the states, but for treaty purposes the state rights can be superseded, and it was felt that the only way the situation there could be handled would be by the Federal Government, and to that end the treaty was made. In 1916, I think it was, or thereabouts—

Q. Just before we get away from that, the regulations, as I take it, were approved by the authorities of the state of Washington?—A. No.

Q. To start with?—A. No.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I wanted to get clear on that.

[Mr. W. A. Fould]

WITNESS: It was a federal treaty, and therefore the state of Washington would not have to approve of it. The state of Washington took the ground that the United States was acting beyond its powers, but that is another side of the matter. If we will come to the last treaty possibly we can deal with the whole of them together.

By Mr. McQuarrie:

Q. Was the approval or disapproval of the treaty due to the fact that the state of Washington did not join in, objected to it?—A. My understanding is that that was certainly the cause of the failure. Some few years later, 1916 I think, the matter was again reopened with the United States with other fishery matters. The result was that a commission was appointed to investigate these various matters, and on the Fraser River question a treaty was decided upon.

Q. What kind of commission was that? An American commission?—A. It was an international commission, consisting of representatives of Canada and the United States. They took evidence on both sides of the line, and made their recommendations to both governments which were approved, and the result was that a treaty was drawn up and signed.

Q. Approved by whom?—A. The treaty was recommended by the commission and approved by the governments of the two countries.

Q. The Federal Government of the United States?—A. The Government as such—that is, the President of the United States, who authorized its signature; but in the United States before a treaty can become law it has to be ratified by the Senate of the United States. That treaty has failed to receive that ratification. I can speak with more authority regarding the regulations under that treaty, as they are more recent, and I was more in contact with them. In fact, I find I have a copy of the treaty here which I can submit. That treaty provided for a very close restriction on fishing on both sides of the line. The prominent features of the protection were the taking of twelve days right out of the peak of the sockeye run, when all fishing equipment would be taken out of the water, and let the whole run of fish go up. A similar close time on either side—the evidence on which it was based—contemplated an escapement to the spawning grounds of at least fifty per cent of the fish. The matter of the Fraser river so far as the Federal Government of the United States is concerned, stands there. It was understood, of course, by us that the reason that the treaty was not receiving ratification was the objection from the State of Washington, possibly not to the treaty itself, but from the standpoint of jealousy of state rights. I am not speaking with authority there. In any event, the treaty was not receiving approval, and it became pretty clear that it was not likely to, and it was suggested to the United States Federal Government that if they were unable to go on with it our department might try to deal with the matter directly with the Fisheries Board of the State of Washington, which had been appointed in that state and given very broad administrative powers. That was accepted by the United States Government, and that effort was made. A meeting was arranged with the Fisheries Board of the State of Washington last December. The whole matter was gone into, but it was not found possible to reach a conclusion, primarily for this reason, that while we were agreed on certain fundamentals that should be adopted, Canada felt that it should receive an assurance from the United States, seeing that it has been getting from 66 to 7 per cent of the fish in recent years, and has that chance of catching them before they enter the Fraser river, that the experience of the past would not be repeated, and we therefore asked for an assurance that at the end of the closed period that was proposed purse seines would not be operated amongst the islands in the gulf of Georgia, and that traps would be properly regulated. We could get no assurance, and as it seemed to us undesirable, to say the

[Mr. W. A. Found]

least, to impose very heavy restrictions on our fishermen, with no chance of ultimately saving the situation, but that the whole thing would be undone again in a little while, no successful outcome resulted. The matter, however, had not been dropped; it had again been taken up with the United States Federal Government, explaining that the experiences had emphasized the necessity for dealing with this matter by treaty.

Q. Has all the negotiation been carried on by correspondence?—A. Oh, no, A commission was appointed. The commission's report has been made, and the meeting with the people—

Mr. McQUARRIE: I understood that you had a commission and the commission made a report recommending the treaty, and the treaty was signed, and then it came up before the United States Senate but it was not approved.

Mr. NEILL: These last negotiations did not get the length of a treaty, in December last.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I am not speaking of that.

WITNESS: That would not, of course, have been a treaty, in any event.

By Mr. McQuarrie:

Q. At the time the treaty came up before the United States Senate, was there a committee of the Senate appointed to consider the matter?—A. Well, all treaties, as I understand it, in the United States Senate go before the Power Relations Committee.

Q. Was Canada represented on that committee at all —A. Oh, no.

Q. Was any one down there from Canada endeavouring to put through the treaty?—A. Oh, no; the United States was a party to that treaty,

Q. Of course, I understand that; but there was no one from our side?—

The CHAIRMAN: Lobbying.

By Mr. McQuarrie:

Q. —lobbying there?—A. I would not like to be responsible for suggesting that that be done.

Q. No efforts on our part to put through the treaty?—A. We put through the treaty.

Mr. GRIMMER: We put through the treaty.

By Mr. McQuarrie:

Q. Nothing was done—that is what I am trying to get at—whether it could have been done or could not have been done, nothing was done?—A. Nothing properly could be done. There would be an awful howl from the United States Government—we got an awful scare about what happened in 1916, when some of us were blamed for lobbying there.

By Mr. Neill: To go back for a minute to Hell's Gate, was that matter adjusted where the salmon could not get up?—A. Oh, yes; that matter has been very satisfactorily adjusted. That is, all the debris that was placed in the Gate has been removed at the expense of the railway. Certain amounts which were doubtful we—

By Mr. Grimmer:

Q. You are not very hopeful that you will be able to arrange a conference with them?—A. I am not without hope. The thing does not look as cheerful as it ought to look, but it is an international time.

Q. Do they recognize the evil?—A. I think so; I cannot state too emphatically—personally, I regard it as nothing short of an international crime to leave this matter unsettled. This continent, both countries, are losing a vast amount of money;

[Mr. W. A. Found]

both countries are spending vast amounts of money in reclaiming, for instance, arid lands, the profits from which will not show the possibilities of what year after year has shown the Fraser river to be capable of producing.

By the Chairman:

Q. Mr. Found, do you know who opposed the ratification of this treaty in the United States? Was it the fishermen?—A. There were certain divided interests in the state of Washington. Those who were having their seines cut out of course opposed it, and opposed it very strongly.

Q. The fishermen themselves?—A. That branch of the fishermen.

By Mr. MacLaren:

Q. Can you suggest any steps to obtain an agreement with the United States?—A. The matter, as I say, has been followed up. The conference with the Fisheries Board of the State of Washington was only last December. When experience did not show that solution to be a very hopeful one, the matter has again been taken up with the United States Government. However, I do not think there is anything more that could be done at the moment.

By Mr. Grimmer:

Q. You cannot get these two jurisdictions together, I suppose?—A. We have endeavoured to. I do not think that a thing that is as important as this, and that is so obvious as this, will ultimately not be properly dealt with. I have faith enough in the common sense of mankind to feel that.

By Mr. Neill:

Q. You do not need to have a treaty now; you can make a deal with this State Board of Washington, can you not?—A. We can, but you will see how undesirable that is either from their standpoint or ours. That Board is the instrument of a state legislature, and can be abolished at any meeting of the legislature. In Canada, an Order in Council can be changed, so that there is no way of satisfactorily dealing with this matter other than by treaty between the two countries.

By Mr. Grimmer:

Q. You say that the fisheries jurisdiction is a state matter over there. I am rather surprised to learn that—A. Much to be regretted, most of them.

Q. On the Atlantic coast, Mr. Johnston is under federal jurisdiction, isn't he?—A. Yes.

Mr. GRIMMER: They have their cutters along our coast.

Mr. JOHNSON: That is beyond the three-mile limit.

Mr. MORRISSY: It must not be lost sight of that they are a peaceful people down there.

WITNESS: State rights are possibly guarded more jealously than provincial rights here.

Mr. GRIMMER: I did not know it was a matter of state rights.

The CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, we will adjourn now and convene again at the call of the Chair.

The Committee adjourned at 1 o'clock p.m., to reconvene at the call of the Chair.

[Mr. W. A. Found]

COMMITTEE ROOM 429,
HOUSE OF COMMONS,
April 28, 1922.

The Select Standing Committee on Marine and Fisheries met at 10 o'clock a.m., the Chairman, Mr. Duff, presiding.

The CHAIRMAN: This meeting is called to hear Mr. Irving from Vancouver.

H. BELL IRVING called and sworn.

The CHAIRMAN: Will you give us a brief statement, Mr. Irving, of what you desire to place before the Committee, and then perhaps some of the members will ask you a few questions.

Mr. DICKIE: I may explain to the Committee that Mr. Bell Irving is the biggest fish man on the British Columbia coast. He is also actively engaged in operations on the American side, so that what he has to say will be of interest and value.

Mr. IRVING: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I had no intention yesterday of coming here before this Committee, as I believed that the matter had been very thoroughly threshed out at a recent date when a delegation came from the coast, of which my son was a member. But I saw Mr. Johnston, the Deputy Minister, yesterday, and he told me that the Committee had been formed to investigate, and that it was very desirable that I should meet the gentlemen on the Committee in order to place my views before them. You will excuse me if the information I propose to give is rather disjointed, because I have not had time to put it together in systematic form. I want particularly to urge upon the members of this Committee the desirability of making a study of the report of the Sanford Commission which sat in 1917. It is the most exhaustive report on the fisheries question of British Columbia which has yet been made. The conclusions and recommendations at the end of the report are not so strong as many of us believe the acute depression of the industry demand. Still, the facts put before the public are exceedingly interesting and very reliable indeed, and I think you will find it of immense advantage to study it. I will just point out a few points which it seems to me are of great importance. On the first page it is stated: (Reads)

"In Canada the Dominion Parliament exclusively has the right of interference with the exercise of the public right to fish in tidal waters, and this right of interference is unlimited, the only recourse lying in the election by the people of a Legislature which will change objectionable laws."

So the Dominion is not in the same position as the United States. The United States Federal Government is very shy of interfering in any way with the fishery laws as these matters are attended to by the State Legislatures. I think the first and most important consideration that faces those interested in the industry and the public in Canada is the conservation of the fish supply. The second is the economic maintenance of the industry, that is, that it should be carried on in a way that will leave a margin of profit for all concerned, fisherman and everybody else, and that cheap and good food would be provided for the people of Canada as well as for export at as reasonable prices as possible. Unfortunately in the past, it seems to us, there has been a disposition to view the action of the canners as selfish and greedy. I would point out that the interests of the fishermen and the canners are closely allied necessarily. One depends on the other, and any injury to one or the other is bound to affect both.

[Mr. H. Bell Irving.]

I visited British Columbia first in 1885. At that time there were only nine cannerys in the whole of British Columbia. I first became interested in the fishery business in 1890, at which time there were 32 cannerys operating in the whole of British Columbia, including 13 on the Fraser River. My company bought out seven of those cannerys on the Fraser River and two on the Skeena River. To-day all our cannerys on the Fraser River are closed down on account of the depletion. The total average pack of sockeye for the last four years on the Fraser River was 32,000 cases as compared with the biggest pack in 1905, I think, of \$37,000 cases. So you will see what a terrible depletion there has been. The situation cannot be looked upon as satisfactory from a business point of view. The reason for the collapse of the business on the Fraser River is a complicated one. Over fishing is undoubtedly responsible for the greater part of the depletion, and what was partly responsible was the blocking of the Fraser River for a period—I forget the date. I refer to the obstructions that were caused by the railway operations on the Fraser River, but I understand they have been very largely removed, and we are reliably informed now that the fish are able to ascend the river and reach their proper spawning beds. Unfortunately, if the fishing operations in Puget Sound and on the Fraser River are not restricted it is probable that the few salmon that are left will be further depleted. It is scarcely reasonable to expect that there will be any substantial improvement unless some very drastic measure is taken for the rehabilitation of the industry.

In the northern waters the depletion of the fisheries is going on apace. As many of you no doubt know, the provincial authorities in 1907-8 took the view that the British Columbia fisheries were not receiving sufficient attention from the Dominion Government in the interests of B.C., and they passed an Act for the purpose of controlling the fisheries with the idea of restricting operations so that they could depend upon the conservation. That Act provided that for a period of five years no more cannerys should be built in those waters, as it was recognized then that there were more than enough already. I might mention first though that in 1905 a Royal Commission was appointed, of which Mr. Sweeney was the Chairman, and which reported strongly in favour of the restriction of the cannery licenses in order that the fisheries should not be depleted.

Mr. PUTNAM: What waters are excluded for the five years?

Mr. IRVING: I have not got that information.

Mr. PUTNAM: Did they include Puget Sound?

Mr. IRVING: No, the waters of British Columbia only.

The CHAIRMAN: Puget Sound is on the American side.

Mr. IRVING: Now I will refer to some of the restrictions. On page 23 of Mr. Evans' report it is pointed out that in the opinion of the British Columbia people they were not afforded sufficient protection. The report says:—

“The Provincial Department developed, for example, views upon the importance of limiting salmon fishing and canning licenses, which were at least more definite than those held by the Dominion authorities, and became disposed to take the initiative and to exercise a positive influence in the matter of restrictions.”

These regulations worked out very satisfactorily until they began to be broken. A little later on efforts were made to get outside of those restrictions, and in 1912, it is reported on page 26, they made a special clause in which special conditions were stipulated that only white fishermen should be employed by a certain canning firm, that a further license should be granted on the Skeena River; and it was on that understanding that this license was granted. It was thought to be a great departure for the benefit of the white fishermen that such a clause should be put in. It is rather noteworthy, and I want to bring it particularly to your notice now, that the

[Mr. H. Bell Irving.]

very firm that got a license in that year on the understanding that only white men should be employed are the very people who are now objecting to the restriction of the employment of Japanese this year.

By Mr. McQuarrie:

Q. What firm is that?—A. I would rather not mention the firm.

Q. Well, if you do not mind, I would like to know.—A. It is Goss & Millard.

An Hon. MEMBER: Perhaps we might agree not to have it incorporated in the minutes of the meeting.

The WITNESS: I would rather it would not be made public.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I would rather that the name of the particular concern be put in.

The WITNESS: It is referred to on page 26 of Mr. Sanford Evans' report.

By Mr. McQuarrie:

Q. I suppose there is no secret about it, is there?—A. Oh, no. They have, I understand, objected to the proposal made by the majority of canners that the number of Jap licenses should be restricted in the interests of the employment of additional white men.

Q. There is nothing necessarily discreditable about it?—A. No; I do not mean to say so at all. I merely give that information to show that they found the imposition of the restriction in the employment of white men practically made their business impossible.

Q. With whom did they put in their objections?—A. You mean as to the restrictions?

Q. To the Department?—A. I understand to the Department here.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Mr. Found says he does not know anything about it.

The WITNESS: Then if it was not put in to the Department it was at Vancouver, because I had that advice by letter last night. The recommendations to the Department were modified accordingly. Of course, that is really unimportant; I consider that is quite an unimportant thing, but it is interesting to show how people's views change when they engage in the business. They tried to carry it on and they found they could not.

By Mr. Putnam:

Q. Is it not important as showing the scarcity of white labour?—A. Yes.

Q. But not important as regards the Government?—A. Yes.

Mr. PUTNAM: That is the way I take it.

The WITNESS: I certainly do not want to say anything detrimental to the firm in question at all.

Mr. McQUARRIE: We are speaking as to the argument that there should not be any restriction of the employment of Orientals.

Mr. PUTNAM: I do not think we should press that.

The WITNESS: No, I do not. I will have something to say about that matter a little later. I do not want to say anything detrimental about the firm in question at all. I would like to impress upon the gentlemen here the fact that in the interests of the conservation of the industry, the idea of restricting the number of canneries is quite an old one; it was recommended in 1905, and that urgency for adopting such restrictions grew stronger and stronger, and of course it is stronger to-day than ever, but the competition now has been so disastrous that it has squeezed a good many out of business, and has caused very heavy losses. I want to quote here from page 27 of Mr. Evans' report a little clause that is of interest. It is a clause passed by the

[Mr. H. Bell Irving.]

Japanese Fisheries' Board in 1916. It says that it is desirable "To discourage all disadvantageous and useless competition, to the end that suitable and orderly progress and development may be made in the fisheries industry." I think that all gentlemen of this Committee will agree that it is a loss to the whole country that money should be wasted in the useless multiplying of plants which may become useless—many of them have become absolutely useless—and that it is almost a duty, and it is certainly a desirable function for the Government, to attempt to prevent such losses in future.

By an Hon. Member:

Q. Could the same thing not be said of the saw-mill industry?—A. Yes; I think it is a national loss that money should be wasted in that way. I think it is a most desirable thing that the wasting of money throughout the Dominion should be discouraged.

Q. Whether in a saw-mill or in a cannery?—A. Or anything else; and if regulations are so devised that it encourages an absolutely useless duplication, whether such as railways running alongside of each other or in any way, I think it is economically wrong.

By Mr. Neill:

Q. Do you think it is the duty of the National Government to interfere to prevent competition in any one particular industry?—A. That is a very big question. There are some things with which the Dominion of course cannot interfere.

Q. Then you confine your attitude to this industry?—A. Oh, no.

Q. Then what is it?—A. This industry is carried on very largely under license from the Government. A grocery store, for instance, is on a different basis.

Q. But the competition is keener; there are more grocers than there are canneries?—A. They are not licensed to the same extent. They do not pay the same amount of taxes to the Government. I may mention that the taxes paid by the canneries are very very high. An average cannery will pay from five up to ten thousand dollars, and it is becoming a very heavy burden under present conditions. As you all know, I think, the salmon canneries, in common with nearly all manufacturing industries, have had very hard times indeed. I do not know that we have had harder times than other people, but certainly they have been hard enough, and when heavy, heavy taxes are imposed it makes conditions perhaps harder than the industry is well able to bear, and we are going to see a good many difficulties and failures. I have before me our balance sheet submitted to our directors in London for the year ending June 30, 1921. I do not submit this with any pride, I can assure you, because it shows a net loss for the year ending June 30, 1921, of £44,711.

By Mr. McQuarrie:

Q. Is that the A.B.C. Company?—A. The A.B.C. Packing Company. Our estimated loss for the following year, that is, the year ending June 30, 1921—

By the Chairman:

Q. That is, this year?—A. Our estimated loss for this coming year, for the year ending June 30 of this present year, will be about £50,000.

By Mr. Neill:

Q. On how many canneries?—A. Well, we have thirteen canneries in British Columbia, and we are running this year only four out of the thirteen.

By the Chairman:

Q. You say that you lost £44,000 last year and expect to lose £50,000 this year. What would you suggest as a remedy for the state of affairs in British Columbia? How should the business be curtailed, if it should be curtailed?—A. My view is that one of the primary causes of this cut-throat competition is the unnecessary multipli-

[Mr. H. Bell Irving.]

cation of canneries, which means that each one of these parties contrives to get all the fish he can. The first thing to do, I think, is to stop granting any more licenses for a term of years so as to give the industry time and opportunity to pull itself together.

Q. Licenses to canneries?—A. Licenses to canneries.

Q. All canneries, or just pick out certain canneries?—A. I would say all salmon canneries in British Columbia. Don't give any more licenses at all for a term of years.

Mr. WARD: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question.

By Mr. Ward:

Q. What brought about this flood of canneries in the first place? Was it not because the business was profitable?—A. Oh, yes; but I want to point out to you that if you had put \$250,000 into canneries and you ran along for a couple of years, and then the number of canneries was suddenly doubled and you found that instead of having a full supply for your canneries you would have to cut down your work by 50 per cent and you would increase your costs and reduce your profits in proportion, it would be a very serious blow, naturally. It is the same as working a mine or working a timber limit; if there are half a dozen people go and encroach on the same ground it naturally means that the pioneer is going to have a hard time, and the industry will finally be rendered unprofitable to all concerned. Our company has never built a cannery wherever it was overdone already. In every case where we have expanded we have bought in other people's interests.

By the Chairman:

Q. Just there, you think that no more cannery licenses should be issued. How is it possible to prevent canners of salmon or men engaged in any other industry from manufacture?—A. It was prevented in British Columbia for a term of years, and it became very serious. It threatened the industry.

Q. No licenses were granted?—A. No licenses were granted.

By Mr. Chisholm:

Q. And that was a serious grievance at the time, wasn't it?—A. Yes, among the few who were barred out, but if there were three canneries in any river to every one that should be there, economically it is surely manifest that there should not be any more built.

Q. Well, if you apply that rule to our lobster fisheries in Nova Scotia you will find a great many people who will say that there is too much competition there and that the proper attitude of the Government should be to abolish a certain number of licenses and confine the operations to a few canneries. There would be a rebellion if anything like that were attempted.—A. Well, I do not think the lobsters move quite as fast as the salmon.

Mr. HATFIELD: As a matter of fact, I think there was a period when there was a restriction on the number of licenses for the canning of lobsters in Nova Scotia. Pressure has been brought to bear on the Government, or representations were made showing what we supposed were unfair conditions, with the result that those restrictions were taken off, and those who conformed with the Government's standards were allowed licenses.

The WITNESS: I think the gentlemen should consider what the industry is up against, and whether or not the salmon canning industry is being dealt with in a way which is conducive to the interests of the general public. When I first went into this business in 1890 I remember the cost of the pack of sockeye salmon alone was \$2.50 a case. We have experienced recently the fact that the cost of the pack has been up to as high as \$25 a case. It is either a question of closing down a number of these canneries or—well, they will have to close down anyway.

[Mr. H. Bell Irving.]

By Mr. Neill:

Q. The least favourably situated ones will close down; those who are least favourably situated for putting up salmon cheaply will be the first to close down?—A. Yes; practically the whole Fraser river is closed down.

By the Chairman:

Q. Would they not have to close down because they could not get the salmon to pack, or is there another reason?—A. There are not the salmon to pack. I have here the sockeye packs on the Fraser river since 1903.

Q. We have all the figures; but that is your idea, that the reason the present canneries do not pay, and are losing money, is because there are not sufficient fish there to supply the different canneries with the fish?—A. That is it.

Q. Well, it is pretty hard to prevent the department from giving licenses to those who wish to engage in fishing. What would you say about, in order to conserve the fish supply, having a close season of one, two, or five years, and grant no licenses to anybody, allow nobody to catch fish or can fish?—A. I have urged most strenuously on many occasions that absolute closing of the Fraser river for a term of years. I was coming to that; that is one of the main recommendations that I would like to make to this Committee.

By Mr. McQuarrie:

Q. Would you do that before having any arrangement with the Americans?—A. Well, that is a moot question. I think it might come all right for you gentlemen to give the Americans an example of the proper way of dealing with that.

Mr. McQUARRIE: We would be helping the Americans.

The WITNESS: Yes. The question of the rehabilitation of the Fraser river seems to me to be absolutely on all fours with the sealing question. The sealing question was settled on a basis of the division of the results between the Canadian interests and the Americans, in which the Americans got the lion's share and the Canadians got the rest. The Americans, I understand, do not quite see eye to eye with the British Columbians with regard to the proportion of catch that they should get on Puget sound as compared with the Fraser river, but it is surely the business of men of any intelligence to get together and try to do something for the rehabilitation of the industry, because it would have been better for all concerned if it had been as it was in 1905, when it produced 837,000 cases; the output would have been worth something like fifteen million on the Fraser river alone, and in place of that thirty-four thousand cases of sockeye was all the sockeye that they got.

By Mr. Putnam:

Q. Have experts given any estimate of how many years it would take to bring the Fraser river back, how many close years to bring it back to normal?—A. Yes, I think so.

Q. How many?—A. I think eight years is looked upon as more or less the minimum.

Q. Would it require anything like that long? Would it require so long as that?—A. My opinion is that it would; it would require eight years. The fish propagate in cycles on the Fraser river of four years, and I think it would take two cycles before the industry could be properly rehabilitated.

Mr. STORK: Is it your opinion that it would then come back to the healthy days?

Mr. IRVING: That is very hard to say.

Mr. STORK: I do not see why it should not.

Mr. McQUARRIE: If the Americans keep on taking the fish there would be no improvement at all.

[Mr. H. Bell Irving.]

Mr. FOUND: We know that when the fishing industry began in 1896 there were three comparatively small years as against one big year. You will see that there is more of a problem than that of restriction. You have to get spawning beds and get your fish there before we can bring the river back to a four year big run.

Mr. DICKIE: Can you explain how the fish reach the Fraser river?

The CHAIRMAN: With regard to the conservation of the fish supply, in case the Federal Government should make an arrangement with the American Government to have a close season do you, being largely interested in the business, think it would be a good idea to have a close season for a number of years?

Mr. IRVING: Absolutely, I have advocated it for many years, as far back as ten years ago. I am strongly in favour of an entire shutting down.

Mr. MACLEAN (Prince): Would it stand a shorter open season now?

Mr. IRVING: I think that is a half-measure, which would be quite inadequate to cope with the situation. The first effort that was made to improve the Fraser river fishing was with the view of bringing the lean years up to a parity with the good years. In the very early days, when I was first identified with the business, there was a very good year, then a pretty good year, and then two poor years. The first idea was to stop the fishing during those lean years so as to bring up results, and so that they would have a fairly level or even supply of fish all the time. However, that fell through. No arrangement could be made with our friends, the Americans, and the whole thing has fallen through. I think it is most desirable that efforts should be renewed, and that steps should again be taken to come to some understanding in the interests of all concerned.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Before you leave the question of cannery licenses, do you know when the restriction on the issuance of cannery licenses was first removed, in what year? Was it in 1919?

Mr. FOUND: After the season of 1919.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Since that time, how many canneries have been constructed?

Mr. IRVING: I cannot tell you—a whole lot.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Since 1920?

Mr. IRVING: Yes, there have been several; I should say quite half a dozen.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I mean new ones?

Mr. IRVING: Early in 1917—I am quoting from the Evans Report—"Early in 1917 notice was given that beginning with 1918 all restrictions as to the number of cannery licenses would be removed."

Mr. McQUARRIE: After the season of 1919 the restrictions were removed?

Mr. IRVING: Yes.

Mr. McQUARRIE: So far as I am aware, no canneries have been constructed since that time?

Mr. IRVING: Not on the Fraser river.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Or at any place in British Columbia?

Mr. IRVING: Perhaps Mr. Found can tell you?

Mr. FOUND: I don't think so, not since 1919.

Mr. IRVING: There was one at Portland Inlet.

Mr. McQUARRIE: That was in 1918.

Mr. IRVING: Time passes so quickly that it is difficult to remember. I thought it was more recent. There is a company on the Nass river.

Mr. McQUARRIE: That was in 1918.

Mr. IRVING: There is another small one on the Nass river.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Now you correct your previous statement?

[Mr. H. Bell Irving.]

Mr. IRVING: Yes, my memory does not go very far.

Mr. McQUARRIE: If that is so, then the removal of the restrictions has not affected the situation at all because no canneries have been built.

Mr. STORK: It is not only a question of having the right to build canneries. You have to go to the banks to get the money and to-day you cannot get a dollar from any of the banks in British Columbia, so that the prohibition is still operating. There has really been no change whatever in that respect.

Mr. IRVING: I would like to make this point: It has always been manifest to everybody that the canneries have been through the mill on various occasions as you know, many of you, who have been identified with British Columbia. You know that at the time of the formation of the British Columbia Packers' Association a number of canneries were in the hands of the bank. It was to save the cannery owners, many of them, from bankruptcy that the British Columbia Packers' Association, was formed largely by the encouragement of the Bank of Commerce and the Bank of Montreal, that was a combination of canners to cheapen production and to co-operate for economic management. They did so. They closed a number of their canneries and operated the best ones. The opportunity was taken by the new combination to put in complete new appliances. You can see how it carried out the idea which was foremost in the minds of that consolidation of canners. The same thing would happen now exactly, if there is no encouragement for a combination for economic production, unless there is some restriction, unless the Government made some restriction with regard to the supply of raw material.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Would you suggest now that the number of cannery licenses be decreased?

Mr. IRVING: I should say that it would be a very wise provision.

Mr. McQUARRIE: How would you work that out?

Mr. IRVING: That is a matter that I will leave to you.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I am trying to get your ideas.

Mr. IRVING: That is asking too much.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I do not think so; I think you should be prepared to give us your ideas.

Mr. IRVING: I think it is not beyond the intelligence of this Committee to devise means that would be fair to all concerned. But I quite agree that that idea would be a most desirable thing, for undoubtedly there are three or four canneries for everyone that should be there.

Mr. McQUARRIE: It is not my idea; I am simply asking you the question. Another thing, have you in recent years operated any canneries on the Fraser river?

Mr. IRVING: Last year we did operate one cannery in a small way, the Phoenix Cannery.

Mr. McQUARRIE: That was last year.

Mr. IRVING: We did.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Previous to that time did you operate any?

Mr. IRVING: All our white canneries were closed.

Mr. McQUARRIE: For how many years?

Mr. IRVING: Two or three years. We operated our big cannery at Anacortes last year, because there was a run of big salmon last year. But we are closing it this year.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Where is that?

Mr. IRVING: On the American side.

Mr. McQUARRIE: You have canneries there still?

[Mr. H. Bell Irving.]

Mr. IRVING: We have a cannery in which we have packed 137,000 cases, as much as the whole pack of the Fraser river this year.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Are there any other British or Canadian canneries on the American side still, for instance, the B.C. Packers?

Mr. IRVING: Yes, they control at Pt. Roberts. Mr. Parker owned it at one time.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Are there any other Canadian concerns operating on the American side?

Mr. IRVING: Mr. Winch had a cannery at Anacortes built in the same year. Mr. Winch and Mr. Todd were in it, and Mr. Welch, a Vancouver man, who has become a naturalized citizen of the United States, built one at Bellingham and is operating still.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you know how many canneries there are on the American side?

Mr. IRVING: I could get the number for you; I cannot give it offhand. The total pack of Alaska this year is over 4,500,000 cases, of which 2,300,000 cases are of Red fish.

The CHAIRMAN: We were discussing a few moments ago the matter of control by the British Columbia Government. What have you to say about that? Do you believe that there should be joint control on the part of the Provincial and Dominion Governments, or that there should be only Federal control of the British Columbia fisheries?

Mr. IRVING: I think the Federal control is probably alright if there was a minister charged with the duty of looking after the fisheries alone. I do not think that the salmon fisheries of British Columbia have received in the past quite sufficient attention. I have always been largely in favour of having an advisory board on the coast there. As you know, it is almost proverbial that any company managed by directors sitting in London and operating in Canada usually make a failure of their business. Now to a certain extent, the same argument might prevail here. At this distance from the coast it is exceedingly difficult for the minister, no matter how good his intentions may be, to keep in close touch with all those numerous details. I think that one of the great dangers that confront us all just now, and that is of particular importance to this committee, is the question of the conservation of the salmon supply in the northern waters. The depletion of the Fraser river is very largely blamed on the Americans, and I think they must accept a great part of the blame, although there has been over fishing on our side as well. But in the north, in those rivers that are entirely within the control of the Dominion authorities, I think it is most desirable that every effort should be made to conserve the fish supply, and it can undoubtedly be done, because those waters are not interfered with by American operations.

Mr. McQUARRIE: You are in favour of a local board for British Columbia?

Mr. IRVING: I am strongly in favour of it.

Mr. McQUARRIE: What would be the powers of that board? Would they be merely advisory, or would they have some administrative powers?

Mr. IRVING: They would have to have considerable power to be of real service. I think their recommendations would have to be acted upon pretty quickly.

Mr. NEILL: Are you expressing your own views or the views of a combination of canners? I ask this because we had a canner from British Columbia the other day and he was completely opposed to that.

Mr. IRVING: I am expressing my own views.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Do you know what the views of the Association are?

Mr. IRVING: I know that on many occasions when the matter was discussed they have been in favour of that.

[Mr. H. Bell Irving.]

The CHAIRMAN: If the Government have qualified overseers in each district and a general inspector for the province, why should there be any necessity for an advisory board? Could not the inspector and the overseers do as good work or better work than an advisory board?

Mr. IRVING: No. When I speak of an advisory board, I mean a board composed of men who are not subject to political exigencies. I know—it is a well known fact—that political exigencies often cause action to be taken which is not always in the best interests of the industry.

The CHAIRMAN: Perhaps you are not aware of the fact that we have a Civil Service Commission which takes all the appointments in connection with the fisheries out of the hands of the politicians?

Mr. IRVING: I am relieved to hear that.

The CHAIRMAN: What I am trying to get at is the jurisdiction, so to speak, of the Provincial Government, what do they do? Have they a Provincial Minister of Fisheries in British Columbia? What do they do with regard to the fisheries?

Mr. IRVING: They are not acting in an executive capacity with regard to the regulations. They have dropped out of that entirely so far as I know. But they do keep an eye on the business, particularly with regard to taxation. They continue to tax us alright.

The CHAIRMAN: That is not taking an interest in the fisheries. Do they do any real work to conserve the fish supply or to regulate the fisheries? My idea is to try to get information as to whether it is good policy to have Provincial or Federal control.

Mr. IRVING: I do not think that there should be dual control.

The CHAIRMAN: You think it is a national industry?

Mr. IRVING: Undoubtedly.

The CHAIRMAN: Then would you say that Federal control should be the only real control?

Mr. IRVING: Federal control is satisfactory to me, only the business should receive a lot more attention than it has received in the past. Now with regard to the question of an embargo on the export of salmon. I see that that is a question which came before your Committee on a former occasion. That has been reported against very strongly in former years, and particularly in the report of Mr. Evans. On page 37 of Mr. Evans' report it is shown how in 1916, sixteen million odd pounds of salmon were taken from British Columbia waters and exported to the United States.

By Mr. Neill:

Q. How many pounds?—A. 16,051,600.

By Mr. McQuarrie:

Q. What year?—A. That is in 1916. "The Canadian canneries submitted a calculation to show that there would have been a net gain to Canada of over half a million dollars if these fish had been canned in this country instead of being exported in a fresh condition; making due allowance for the amount paid the fishermen in excess of the amount the Canadian canners had been prepared to pay." We have sympathy with the fishermen, who find it very hard to make a living, it is a hard, rough life in any case, but I think you will all agree that a man who has put his money into a plant and brought the market right to the door of the fishermen, or right close to the fisherman, is deserving of some consideration, and if foreigners are permitted to come in and take away his raw material so that he has to stand idle, it is detrimental, apart from the actual loss that the country sustains. I have not checked this statement in this report, but I have no reason to doubt that it is about

[Mr. H. Bell Irving.]

correct in round numbers. I should say that the average amount per case in labour, cans, boxes, labels, work in processing, and transportation and so forth would amount to about from \$3.50 to \$5 a case, according to the kind.

By Mr. Putnam:

Q. The exporters of the fish are not all foreigners, I presume; they are not all foreigners who do that easy thing?—A. All this export referred to in the report was exported to the American side.

Q. But it was not all done by foreigners, I should think. You spoke about allowing foreigners to come in against the capitalists in Canada; I presume Canadians were at that too?—A. Quite so.

By Mr. Hatfield:

Q. For canning purposes?—A. Yes.

Q. Or the fresh market?—A. This says that in 1916 certain American canners took from Southern British Columbia waters sixteen million pounds of salmon, and the Canadian canners submitted a calculation, as I have just read to you.

By Mr. Martell:

Q. Doesn't that mean that they come in with their smacks, take the fishermen's catches and take them to the United States to be canned?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Neill:

Q. Or to be sold fresh?—A. Or to be sold fresh, yes.

By Mr. Martell:

Q. Would not the tendency to lessen that have a tendency to lessen the profits made by reason of it, with regard to keeping up the prices of the fishermen?—A. It is a question whether this Committee considers the loss to the Dominion of an average of from four dollars a case to probably a few cents a case.

Q. I quite understand you in that?—A. Which is the most important?

Mr. MARTELL: But you are speaking absolutely from the canners' standpoint. If there were an embargo on the exportation of salmon it would mean that you would have the Canadian fishermen under your thumb, and would thus get in a combine and compel them to give you fish at your price without the American competition.

The CHAIRMAN: Of course he is only giving his own side of it. We will get the other side of it afterwards.

Mr. MARTELL: I think the point is relevant.

The WITNESS: I quite admit that the American competition will enhance the value. Do you all consider that the enhancing of the price to the fishermen is of benefit to the public?

Mr. MARTELL: Exactly.

By Mr. Hatfield:

Q. Is there a very appreciable fresh market on the American side? Do the salmon which are sold fresh to be used fresh make up a very large proportion of the whole? What is the proportion? Are there many sold on the American market to be consumed fresh?—A. No; I think very very few would be consumed, a very small proportion. The boats that come over, are as far as I know, almost entirely working for canners.

By Mr. Putnam:

Q. Do they do that more economically than the Canadian canners?—A. No. I think one of the reasons that this exportation has been carried on has been partly this, on the American side, the making of the labour contracts for processing inside

[Mr. H. Bell Irving.]

the canneries. These contracts are for a guaranteed amount, a guaranteed output; in other words, the Chinese contractor extracts a guarantee from the packer that he shall pack thirty thousand cases or fifty thousand cases of salmon, and the Chinese contractor is paid that amount for packing fifty thousand cases of salmon even if he only packs twenty-five thousand, and the consequence is that the canner over there is faced with this condition: Shall he lose forty or fifty cents a case and pay the labour, or shall he go out and pay a little more? Shall he go out and buy in British Columbia and bring the stuff over there so as to fill up his cans?

Q. Doesn't the Chinaman negotiate just as readily with regard to price as the Canadian?—A. It is not the custom in British Columbia to guarantee the pack.

Mr. PUTNAM: The American is more enterprising or something.

Mr. FOUND: Will you permit me one question, Mr. Chairman? Does the fish that the American smackman would buy in British Columbia cost as much landed at the cannery if he paid the same price for it as if he had bought it on the United States side, keeping in view the license fees that are payable and that are escapable?

Mr. NEILL: And the distance it has to go.

The WITNESS: That is a question I cannot answer at once.

Mr. FOUND: Allow me to put it in another way, Mr. Chairman, to bring it before the Committee.

The WITNESS: Because it means a whole lot of figuring as to taxation, etc.

By Mr. Found:

Q. This is what I had clearly in mind; the license fee in Washington runs from eight cents a fish down; the fish bought on the Canadian side are not subject to any license, are they?—A. Yes.

Mr. FOUND: That is the license fee in catching fish.

Mr. NEILL: Per fish?

Mr. FOUND: Per fish.

The WITNESS: I have not these things in my head.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Does that eight cents go to the country?

The CHAIRMAN: I understand you to say that the American canners have to pay a higher license than the Canadian?

Mr. FOUND: I will explain myself now; I am sorry to have brought up the matter at all, but I saw a point which I thought the witness ought to be making to the Committee and was not making, in bringing out both sides of the question. That is, that the American who is getting his fish on the American side has to pay not only for the cost of the production of that fish, but he has to pay a heavy license fee. When he comes and buys them on the Canadian side, they are entered as foreign-caught fish and are not subject to any license on the American side, and there is no duty.

The WITNESS: I was unable to give the exact figures.

Mr. PUTNAM: I understood the witness to make an admission that the loss of his own company is due to the fact that his directors are away in London, or partly due to that.

The WITNESS: I am afraid you misunderstood me. I do not think I said that.

Mr. PUTNAM: You made a remark from which I gathered that impression.

The WITNESS: I gave it as an instance in furtherance of the idea that for a Committee or Commission in British Columbia, a resident Commission over there, to take a hand in the matter would be desirable. I pointed out that many concerns which are controlled by directors in London have not been successful. Take for instance, the Grand Trunk Pacific; that is just an instance. I spoke in a very general way.

[Mr. H. Bell Irving.]

Fortunately for our company they have left the management of affairs very largely to my firm. I say, fortunately—

The CHAIRMAN: If you will excuse me, gentlemen, I have to attend a very important meeting. Just go ahead and give all the evidence that you have to give, and these gentlemen will ask some questions, and I will read the evidence afterwards.

Mr. PUTNAM: Perhaps wrongly, I understood the witness to mean that it was a handicap for a great many companies doing business in Canada that their directors were in London.

The WITNESS: I think in a general way, most gentlemen will agree with me there.

Mr. PUTNAM: If so, it has probably something to do with many losses that you complain of in the fishing industry.

The WITNESS: There are very few concerns indeed who are so represented, but, as I say, the management of this business had been left to our firm very largely.

(The CHAIRMAN at this point left the Committee Room, and his place was taken by Mr. STORK.)

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I hope the remainder of the Committee will stay here; otherwise the Committee will have to close down.

The WITNESS: There are one or two points that I think are worth while to bring before this Committee.

By Mr. McQuarrie:

Q. With regard to the embargo?—A. With regard to the embargo, I am strongly in favour of such an embargo being put on. It did exist in former years.

Q. Your proposal in regard to the embargo is that it is better for the country to allow the canners on this side of the line to can their fish than it is to allow Americans to come in and pay our fishermen higher prices for the fish than our cannerymen would do?—A. I think it is in the interests of the public of the Dominion of Canada that the fish should be processed and manufactured in Canada.

By Mr. Neill:

Q. Is it within your knowledge that the canneries who adhered to that principle themselves—if I were to tell you that the Wallace Fisheries shipped out fresh fish when they got the chance, to the American side, despite the fact of the howl they put up about an embargo, would you believe it?—A. Well, I would believe anything the Wallace Fisheries would tell me; I have great respect for their manager. I want to point out a remark on page 25 of the report with regard to the restriction on canneries. It says: "That under the Fishery Regulations of 1908 it became necessary to obtain, from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries a license before operations could be undertaken, and it was set forth that no additional canneries would be licensed in the Northern District of British Columbia." I am going back to a subject that I covered before, but I do not think that I covered that.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I think the report should be filed.

The WITNESS: I think every gentleman on the Committee should have a copy of it. It is the most exhaustive and best report on the fisheries that has ever been made. It says, "The Government of British Columbia and its Fishery Department had for years advocated restriction." Now, I am not alone, you see, with regard to the restriction. It says, "The Government of British Columbia had advocated restriction." Mr. Bowser, when he was in charge passed that Act, and in 1908 passed a Canners Revenue Act which provides—and this is important: "It shall be unlawful for any person to operate a cannery in this Province unless and until such person shall have been duly licensed under this Act and shall have paid the license fee and obtained the license hereinafter provided." That was for the express purpose of limitation. "We

[Mr. H. Bell Irving.]

understand it was the intention of this Act to enforce a limitation of the number of canneries if the Dominion had not taken action." By Order in Council in 1907, section 19 of the Fishery Regulations of 1894 was amended to read that all salmon caught shall be frozen, canned, salted, cured or smoked in the Province of British Columbia before being exported.

By Mr. McQuarrie:

Q. Would you be in favour of the same policy with regard to wheat?—A. No, I am a fish man. I do not know anything about wheat. I would not like to express any opinion on wheat.

By Mr. Neill:

Q. But with regard to the embargo?—A. I would not express any opinion about wheat at all.

By Mr. McQuarrie:

Q. You would confine this embargo to fish?—A. I merely read a clause showing what had been done in the past. This was fishery regulation passed in 1907 which prevented any salmon from being exported until it had been manufactured.

Q. You would discriminate against the fishermen; you would not extend that to any other class at all; is that so?—A. Well, as I have tried to show the number of canneries is far in excess of the quantity of fish that usually can be caught. There may be times when there was an excess, but it was very small. In the report here dated December 31, 1920, that is, a report of the Commissioner of Fisheries for the Province of British Columbia, it is pointed out that conditions on the Skeena River are not satisfactory, and call for careful and conservative treatment. On page S—7 of this report it says: "The records there indicate unmistakably that fishing for sockeye should be diminished and not increased." With regard to the Nass River, on the same page it says, "The catch of sockeye on the Nass from 1909 to 1920 produced an average pack of 28,917 cases. Conditions there are distinctly alarming and call for most conservative action. If conditions are not radically changed the Nass River must be classed in the list of depleted streams. Fishing for sockeye has been more extensive than the run to that river will stand. The drain is far too heavy." All this data, gentlemen, I think will prove that there has been excessive fishing and that the number of plants is far in excess of what it should be economically, and I can assure you that notwithstanding careful management—and our company I think has had a fairly good record for careful management—and no interference from directors in England, we have sustained very very heavy losses, and I think it will be found that nearly every concern operating in British Columbia have sustained losses in the same way. The fishermen have got very high prices, far too high prices, more than the situation warranted, and it is perfectly manifest that no workman can get out of any industry more than the industry can earn. It may last for a year or two, but it cannot go on.

By Mr. Hatfield:

Q. Why would you pay more than the situation warranted?—A. I think I can answer that question in this way, that the producers all over Canada were urged by the Government to produce that it was their duty to produce, and we were all stimulated to produce for all we were worth. I do not mean to say that we produced when we were going to make a loss, but certainly the exhortations to produce had a considerable effect upon the minds of the manufacturers and we did go and produce on a very large scale; then the slump suddenly came and we were compelled to sell our product for in some cases half of what it actually cost us to pack. I can give you some particulars as to that. I have cost sheets here which are authentic, and going back for several years.

[Mr. H. Bell Irving]

Mr. NEILL: Mr. Chairman, I think we all know that the canneries have been losing money for the last few years, but what industry is there which has not been losing money?

The WITNESS: Quite so.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: There are many things which have contributed to the losses of the cannery which would be found in any other industry. I know of one particular cannery on the Skeena river which was running last year, and the manager told me that they were running purely to clean up their stock of tin. He said, "we have a stock of tin plate that will depreciate before the end of the year to the extent of \$30,000, and we feel that it is better to fill the tins and get rid of this stock rather than go on until the end of the year and then just write off a depreciation of the tin of \$30,000." So there are many influences that enter into the situation.

Mr. NEILL: In this after-war time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN: Exactly.

Mr. NEILL: Have you any record of the amount of fresh fish exported to the United States last year?

Mr. IRVING: No, I have not.

Mr. NEILL: Those of us who come from British Columbia know—I am not referring to the Bell-Irving Company which is a reliable company—is it not within your knowledge that the heavy losses which it is said the individual cannery have suffered is caused by the fact that at certain periods they were bought up by combinations at such tremendous prices that it was impossible for them to pay interest on the money? I am not applying this to the Bell-Irving Company, but I have in mind that a combination of cannery was formed, in which certain politicians took part, to buy up the cannery at big prices, and then they were expected, by some unknown means, to provide dividends on the inflated watered stocks. Does the witness have any knowledge of anything of that kind?

Mr. IRVING: I am not able to give you any particulars. I am not able to confirm those statements except in a general way. I know that in some instances that has undoubtedly been done; but I would point out that heavy losses have been suffered on the operating account. I do not know absolutely the amounts of money put into those combinations.

Mr. JOHNSON: On the question of conservation, I confess I have some difficulty as to how it is to be effected by a restriction of the cannery. Is it not a factor in conservation the number of fishermen who are actually employed?

Mr. IRVING: When I made that remark I had this in mind; that there is no encouragement for the economic running of the cannery so long as it is possible for new-comers, as soon as conditions become better, to slide in and come into competition. Therefore, the first thing to be done is to prevent any more cannery from being built. The conditions are not economic at the present time. People are losing money, and they are bound to go on at a loss.

Mr. JOHNSON: Apart altogether from that, would your view not lead ultimately to the employment of fewer fishermen in British Columbia waters?

Mr. IRVING: Fewer men, most assuredly.

Mr. JOHNSON: Fewer fishermen?

Mr. IRVING: Men who may be employed to advantage in other industries—certainly fewer men. It is necessary that fewer men should be employed because our cost of production is quite excessive. I want to impress upon the members of the Committee the fact that we have been up against competition from Alaska. They produce a very good article up there, and they have been producing from 2,000,000 to 3,000,000 cases of red sockeye. Now we are up against Siberian competition. Within the last twelve months they have sold in England over 350,000 cases, and they have

[Mr. H. Bell Irving.]

sold the whole of their 1921 Siberian pack. All that has gone into competition directly with the British Columbia article, and the reputation under which that Siberian sale now goes on was made on the merits of the British Columbia pack. The dealers are now putting their labels on the Siberian pack and the public are getting it in that way at a much cheaper price than we are able to produce it.

Mr. JOHNSON: I was trying to avoid the question of cost altogether. I was trying to get down to the question of conservation. You talk about the restriction of the number of canners but that does not necessarily imply conservation, does it?

Mr. IRVING: No, but it will be a big step towards it.

Mr. JOHNSON: I am free to confess that I have difficulty—I am unable to see that if three canners put out a pack of say 300,000 cases, that would be a larger conservation factor than if six canners were to put up 300,000 cases, 50,000 cases each, instead of 100,000 each.

Mr. IRVING: If you put it that way, it is possible to carry on the business, but I say that you cannot maintain the industry the way it is now.

Mr. JOHNSON: I am not asking you as to that. What I am almost irresistibly drawn to by your observations is that the necessity is there for limiting the number of fishermen more than the number of canneries.

Mr. IRVING: The two, I think, should go hand in hand.

Mr. McQUARRIE: In that connection, would it not help if you did away with the use of traps and seines?

Mr. IRVING: There are no traps used now in the northern waters. I know we have been prevented from using traps.

Mr. FOUND: The only place in the north where they are used is in the Portland Canal.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: There is one on Wales Island.

Mr. FOUND: It is up above Wales Island, it is up the Portland Canal.

Mr. IRVING: You see the expense of running a single trap up there with all the equipment necessary, the personnel and so forth, is such that it cannot be done.

Mr. NEILL: Are there not two traps there?

Mr. IRVING: I do not think there are any traps there just now at all.

Mr. FOUND: The policy is not to allow any traps except where the line of fishing is on the other side. They are restricted to the southern end of Vancouver Island and where the Fraser runs along the Portland canal.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Would you do away with those traps?

Mr. IRVING: We are not using them. The cost is too enormous to run one trap. If we can run three traps we are able to pull out without a loss, but we have lost money on those traps.

Mr. McQUARRIE: But there are some traps being operated?

Mr. IRVING: Oh, yes, in the Sound.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Do you think they should be allowed to continue?

Mr. IRVING: I think so.

By Mr. McQuarrie:

Q. What about seining?—A. So long as the conservation of the fish supply is kept strictly in mind, I believe in allowing the fish to be caught in the cheapest manner possible.

Mr. NEILL: Not in the most advantageous manner?

[Mr. H. Bell Irving.]

By Mr. McQuarrie:

Q. They will catch more by the seine than the fishermen will catch?—A. In some places. In some places it is the only manner in which you can catch them. As you understand the seines circle round.

Q. The reason I am asking these questions is that fishermen have said to me that the traps and seines should be done away with, and I wanted to get your ideas?—A. I do not think that the seines should be done away with.

Q. It is a wholesale manner of catching fish?—A. It is a cheap way of catching fish.

Q. But it is catching fish by wholesale?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Johnson:

Q. It is indulged in by your competitors?—A. We indulge in it ourselves.

Q. And you have to adopt similar measures?—A. Yes.

By Mr. McQuarrie:

Q. Along the same lines, would it be possible to get rid of the Japanese? We have been told that a great many Japanese are engaged in the fisheries. The figures have been submitted to the Committee already?—A. Yes.

Q. What would your ideas be on that subject?—A. Naturally we would all prefer to see good white fishermen engaged in the industry, but I think you will allow that you would not encourage any friends of yours, who came to you and asked for advice as to what occupation they should take up, to go into the fishing business. As you know, the white fishermen who follow fishing as a profession are limited in number, and they consist more of the flotsam and jetsam of the community, men who drift around, and have no fixed home. I cannot conceive that you can produce the best and most useful citizen by encouraging the white man to go into the fishing business. He floats around, and he has no home. The white fishermen live where they can, they are moving around so much, and they are mostly unmarried—a great many are unmarried. There are, of course, some very fine, some splendid men who get very big catches, but I know that I would not recommend any friend of mine to go into the fishing business as a fisherman because it is so intermittent; there is no steady employment that can be got as yet in British Columbia in the fishing industry which will keep them employed all through the year as there is in the Old Country.

Q. Should we not build up a community of white fishermen?—A. Well, it has been tried, and it has not been successful.

Q. I cannot agree with your statement of the facts as to the white fishermen being flotsam and jetsam?—A. I mean a large proportion of them.

Q. We have a great many in my constituency, men who try to make a living by fishing all the year round, men who have wives and families and who are good citizens, who are bringing up families that will be good citizens?—A. I would like to know how many fishermen there are with families in your constituency who carry on fishing every year—a very small number.

Q. No, a great many?—A. The Fraser river is of course differently situated from any other.

Q. Well the fishermen who fish on the Fraser river also fish in other waters?—A. Some.

Q. A great many. On the Atlantic coast the fishing is done by white men, and why cannot it be done by white men on the Pacific?—A. Well—

Q. You see it is a very important question?—A. It is, quite important.

Q. I would like to get your views?—A. I think the white fishermen have had a good opportunity of tackling it.

Q. Have they, when the Japs are there; that is the point?—A. They are confronted with Japanese competition, and we are confronted with Japanese competition. As you know, there is 77 per cent of the salmon of British Columbia that has in the

[Mr. H. Bell Irving.]

past been exported to the Old Country, and only 22 per cent consumed in Canada. We are up against that Japanese competition.

Q. Now from an economic standpoint and considering it as a canner, do you not think it would be advisable to get along without the Japanese in the fishing industry in British Columbia?—A. It would cause quite an upheaval if anything drastic were done.

Q. Why?—A. We could not get the fishermen.

Q. You have not the fisherman there now? Could we not bring in white fisherman?

By Mr. Neill:

Q. Would not the demand create the supply?—A. I do not think so, not for a considerable time. I do not think it is possible. It takes some time for a man to learn to be a fisherman. If you peruse the records of the catches of the Japanese fishermen and the white fishermen, you will very soon see how it is that the cannerymen depend on the Japanese fishermen. It is a most arduous, a terrible life.

Q. That is to say, the Japanese are catching more fish than the white fishermen?—A. On the average, they do.

Q. So that if you want to reduce the number of fish to be caught, if you eliminate the Japanese you will go a long way towards that?—A. Conservation of the industry.

Q. I would like to get this question on the records. A few moment ago when you were talking about the embargo on fish exported to the United States, I tried to get you to say that you were advocating it in the interests of the cannerymen only. You especially said that you regarded it as being in the best interests of the Canadian public. Now, do you really think, as man to man, that it is more to the advantage of the public, or more to the disadvantage of the public that a few shiploads of your fresh fish should be exported and sold to the Americans; whether it is better that practically the whole fishing industry of British Columbia, from the working man's point of view, should be in the hands of the Orientals? You suggest that the fishermen should sacrifice their living for the public advantage of Canada, so that the raw material may be manufactured in Canada. Which is better; that or taking the whole fishing industry which, as you yourself admit, is rapidly being monopolized by the Japanese with their undesirable and unassimilable habits—which is the most worth some sacrifice to achieve that object, the elimination of the Japanese or the prevention of our fish being sold to the Americans?—A. Undoubtedly to my mind, there is no doubt about it, it is better that the pack should be put up in Canada because a larger amount of employment will be given, and in these days of acute unemployment you are providing a larger amount of employment by having the industry carried on in British Columbia rather than exporting the raw material. It means the employing of a larger number of men, and a substantially larger amount of money is involved. What is paid to the Chinaman for processing is a comparatively small part of the total cost of the pack—say 50 cents.

By Mr. McQuarrie:

Q. Do you find the Japanese more satisfactory to employ than the white men?—A. I would rather have a good white man any day, undoubtedly.

Q. Is that the policy of your company?—A. Oh yes; we always give the preference to white men.

Q. I have a number of complaints from the fishermen that the cannerymen particularly in the North—and there will be no reference particularly to your company—have not been giving the white men a square deal?—A. Oh yes; you cannot prevent such reports.

Q. The Great War Veterans and Associations like that have been telling me that a white man, particularly a returned man cannot get a fair chance at all?—A. Well, of course we have had to deal with returned men on many occasions, and some of them

[Mr. H. Bell Irving.]

can fish but a great many of them cannot, and when you put a returned man into a boat, you are courting trouble and danger. It is really dangerous to life to put them into a boat and ask them to go out and fish if they are not experienced, and some of them may fish for a day or two and then go away. We have brought back a whole lot of men whose fares we had paid. Some places are not desirable for white men to operate in. We have paid their fares, and have had to send them back at their own request because they were so poor.

Q. Your idea is that it is no use trying to make a fisherman out of a man who does not know the work?—A. Oh yes. In that report of Mr. Evans' you will notice a remark that the Commission makes: "It was not until your Commissioners reached the Skeena River that they found the first man who was the outright owner of a boat and net, and the total number of such is very small." I know in your constituency there are quite a few on the river.

Q. Not as many as there used to be?—A. No; well, there are not the fish to catch.

Q. There are more Japanese.—A. When I was first identified with the business on the Fraser river they were all Indians in those days; I am speaking of away back in 1889 and 1890. The cannery paid the fishermen \$2.50 per day for the fishing and \$2 for the boat, and we got all the fish we wanted. It was only after that date that they began to restrict the issue of licenses direct to the fishermen.

Q. Did the white men get into the industry before the Japanese, or the Japanese before the white men?—A. Oh, the white men before the Japanese.

Q. There was a time when the Indians and the white men did the fishing?—A. Entirely, yes. There were very few white men—almost all Indians. The Indians flocked over in large numbers.

Q. Then the white men got into the work?—A. But the number of boats employed was quite small in comparison to what are employed now.

Q. When did the Japanese start?

By Mr. Neill:

Q. Who introduced them?—A. They introduced themselves.

Q. Were they not brought in by the cannery?—A. No.

By Mr. McQuarrie:

Q. When did the Japanese start, do you know, Mr. Bell Irving? When did they first come to the country?—A. I cannot tell you. I would like to know, Mr. Neill, what you mean by introduction by the cannery.

By Mr. Neill:

Q. I beg your pardon?—A. Might I ask you to explain, so that I can get your question properly. You asked if the Japanese were introduced by the—

Q. Who introduced the Japanese?—A. What do you mean by introducing them? Do you mean bringing them over?

Q. Encouraging them to come into the fish business by giving them employment in the first instance.—A. Oh, they came to us these fellows; we did not introduce them. They came to us and begged for employment.

By Mr. McQuarrie:

Q. Do you think that the policy of the Government of gradually eliminating the Japanese can be worked out, should be worked out?—A. I think no cannery would object to regulations which would encourage the introduction of the right class of white men.

Q. Gradually eliminating the Japanese?—A. Yes. Nothing should be done in a drastic way.

Q. I do not mean that they should be cut off at one time, with one fell swoop, but the thing should be done gradually; you think that is the proper policy?—A. Yes. Well, I confess that with any white man who has a regard for his family I would like

[Mr. H. Bell Irving.]

to see him in another occupation than fishing for salmon. It is incidental. The employment is for too short a period.

Q. Well, you have different species of salmon, of course; and as I understand it, some species are caught practically at all times of the year?—A. Oh, yes, that is a comparatively small number.

Q. And then they could go in for the herring and cod?—A. At times there will be employment. It may be that when the fisheries are further developed employment may be provided all the year round so that men can work all the year round, as it is in the Old Country, more or less.

Q. Yes; I was thinking about the Old Country; in the Old Country, of course, we all know that the fishermen during the war were very useful and did splendid work.—A. Splendid work.

Q. And the success of the war to a certain extent depended on them. Now, if we got the same class of men out here on the Pacific, would they not also be very useful in time of need?—A. Oh, I am sure they would.

Q. Is it not, then, a very desirable thing that we should try to work up to that point?—A. I think it is. I think we would all like to see the establishment of a good reliable class of fishermen.

Q. Then how is that to be done? How can that be done?—A. How can it be done? Very difficult. There can be no compulsion. There are some white men who get licenses now and hand them over to the Japanese because they do not want to do the work themselves.

Q. Of course, that is contrary to regulations?—A. Yes.

Q. If you ever bring any cases of that kind to the attention of the Department, I am sure action will be taken.—A. But that is penalizing the men who get licenses.

Q. That does not matter; if he is doing something that is illegal, he should be punished for it. There is another matter, Mr. Bell Irving, that personally I should like to have you discuss; that is the question of propagation, as to whether you are in favour of the system that has been used by the Department, artificial propagation?—A. I am not an expert on that matter at all, very far from it—

Q. Do you know Mr. Doyle?—A. Oh, yes.

Q. Do you agree with his ideas?—A. I do to a certain extent. The operations on the Columbia river, which have brought that river up to its present standard, have rehabilitated the river very considerably. And the methods employed there, I believe, can be successfully made use of in British Columbia in the same manner. The hatcheries have not been successful on the American side in the past until that system was adopted. That is in a very general way, but I think that that is the outstanding feature of it.

Q. You would not care to discuss propagation at all, except generally?—A. In a general way. I am a believer in assisting Nature as far as possible, particularly with regard to opening up so as to give access to the spawning grounds.

Q. Would you continue the use of hatcheries?—A. Yes, particularly if the methods which have been successful farther south were adopted. I do not think the present methods have been successful.

By Mr. Dickie:

Q. Mr. Bell Irving, do you think there is any chance of bringing the Fraser river back with the traps at Point Roberts as they are to-day?—A. Well, the traps extend right clean down for seventy-five miles, a long way down.

Q. Well, say with those traps in operation?—A. I think it is almost essential that an understanding should be come to in that regard because in 1909, for instance, they packed a million cases. They packed 1,097,000 cases as compared with 542,000 cases on the Fraser river. They packed double the quantity and I think—

Q. If those traps were eliminated, would not that have the effect of putting forward a great inducement to a white fishing population?—A. You mean if the Fraser river were rehabilitated. I think it would be an immense thing.

[Mr. H. Bell Irving.]

Q. I know Mr. Babcock very well, and he has taken a great interest in the fishing. We have tried time and time again, have we not, to enter into arrangements with the Americans, unsuccessfully?—A. Yes, I think Mr. Found can tell you about that.

Q. It would seem to me that that would be almost a necessity before anything could be done toward rehabilitating the fishing?—A. Yes; I think it is very desirable.

Q. Mr. Babcock in his last report says that the sockeye fishing is practically gone as far as commercial enterprise is concerned, on the Fraser river?—A. Oh, it is gone, there is no question about that. We tried last year to run one of our canneries out of seven on a small scale and it was not successful, but still the run was a failure elsewhere and we did just about as well as anybody else, but we lost money on it.

Q. Would you think, Mr. Bell Irving, with those traps maintained at Point Roberts, that they should still have the first right at the south end of Vancouver Island. —A. I think so, I have stated in my evidence already, that I think it would be unjust to have those traps taken out. There has been a lot of time and money spent in testing that ground, and I think it would be very unfair to insist upon those traps being taken out just now,—not until the Americans take out theirs.

By Mr. McQuarrie:

Q. When you spoke about closing the Fraser river did you refer only to closing it to sockeye fishing, or for other species of salmon?—A. Sockeye; I would not close it for spring salmon.

The Committee adjourned at 11.55 a.m. to reconvene at the call of the Chair.

COMMITTEE ROOM 424,

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

MAY 18, 1922.

The Select Standing Committee on Marine and Fisheries met at 11 o'clock a.m., the Chairman, Mr. William Duff, presiding.

The CHAIRMAN: I understand that Mr. Neill has a telegram which he wishes to read.

MR. NEILL: I just wish to bring this to the attention of the Committee. A number of the British Columbia fishermen asked the Department to appoint two or three unpaid guardians. They say that a large number of people are fishing without licenses, and some are fishing outside the three-mile limit, where it is held the Government has no control, and very often they are Japs. The regular fishery guardians are hundreds of miles away and do not know anything about it, and they claimed that if unpaid guardians were appointed they would stop that. Seeing that there was no money involved the Department agreed to the proposal, and they allowed me to nominate two men as unpaid guardians. It is the only bit of patronage I have enjoyed. I left it in the hands of the fishermen on the west coast to choose the men and they nominated Olsen and Redford. I have known them for several years, and I can guarantee that they are reputable men. I have received this telegram from Olsen. (Reads):

"Japs have concocted up bribery charge against me to prevent me being appointed Deputy Guardian. I have been warned that if I don't stop case against them I will be run down. Many boats fishing off Clayoquot without license. We demand full investigation by Department at once."

[Mr. H. Bell Irving.]

This is signed Chris Olsen. I should think that if Olsen was guilty of bribery he would be very foolish to demand an investigation. It is the old game of the Jap; when he cannot get round the law one way he will try another. Now he is going to do it in spite of—I was going to say hell.

Mr. STORK: That is the right word.

The CHAIRMAN: Have you taken the matter up with the Department?

Mr. NEILL: Yes.

Mr. FOUND: We will attend to it to-night.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Millerd is here from British Columbia. He is a salmon packer, and while this meeting was called to hear the balance of Mr. Found's evidence, in view of the fact that Mr. Millerd is here we might hear what he has to say.

F. MILLERD called and sworn.

The WITNESS: I have not a statement prepared. I came to town last night and happened to drop into Mr. Found's office this morning, and he informed me that the Committee was going to meet this morning and suggested that I might have something to say. Probably the biggest question that we have on the Pacific Coast is the embargo on raw salmon. Of course, on the coast we may look at it in a more or less biased way; still, I have never been able to see just why the raw material should be allowed to go out free and then when we send out the manufactured article there is a tax on it into the United States. That is one angle that I have not been able to reconcile. Then on the other hand this fish goes out; the United States buyers do not pay any more money for it than we would pay for it. They have no plants, they pay no taxes either in license, taxes on their income, or in any shape or form. All they have is a boat that is registered in the United States, comes over and collects those fish and takes them out, and that is the last that British Columbia gets out of it—except in some cases it has been done, that they have taken out salmon in a very poor condition and canned it in the United States and then they have sold it as British Columbia salmon. If it turns out to be poorer than their own particular grade, or at least the same grade, they just call it British Columbia salmon. That has been done in several cases.

By Mr. Stork:

Q. Is there anything, Mr. Millerd, to prevent them from labelling any poor pack of salmon British Columbia? You could not stop them doing that, even if there was not a pound of British Columbia salmon in their pack; is that correct?

Mr. FOUND: Oh, no.

The WITNESS: According to the law they are supposed, I think, to label the salmon according to the district in which it is packed. I am not very well posted on the exact labelling laws in the United States, but I do know cases where they have taken out salmon, poor salmon, and they have labelled it British Columbia salmon and it has been sold in the United States under that particular name. Take the position on the west coast of Vancouver Island. We have one plant on Alberni Canal, and if there is not an embargo or a duty put on raw salmon, as far as canning salmon there is concerned—the question is whether we will be able to get sufficient to operate successfully. You realize how it is in the canning industry. For instance, if I have a salmon cannery on Puget Sound, and I get a certain amount of salmon at Puget Sound, and I can increase that by the catch I get from British Columbia, I can pack that salmon cheaper, my overhead is less, whereas if I am left in British Columbia

[Mr. F. Millerd.]

with just half that fish to pack, it is a question whether I can pack it at all and get it to the markets of the world. Take on the Fraser River, in a good many cases we supply the fishermen with the houses in nearly all the cases—about 75 per cent, probably, anyhow; we furnish the houses that they live in, we furnish them with net racks to dry their nets and bluestone tanks to bluestone their nets, and give them a lot of facilities, and they give us a certain percentage of our fish. I might say that Pirates, coming from the other side get a certain percentage, and the very same thing applies; they get a certain amount of fish in Puget Sound and a certain amount in British Columbia waters, which brings down the cost of their pack and increases the cost of ours, because we have that much less fish to can. There has been some argument, I think, at some stages about the fact that the American buyers come over to British Columbia and it increases the price of the raw material to the fishermen, and that the country derives some benefit in that way. I do not agree with that.

Mr. SPENCER: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the witness a question?

By Mr. Spencer:

Q. Are not some of the American buyers that you mentioned, Canadian canners who have got canneries on the other side?—A. Some of the buyers that come over are Canadian canners who have got canneries on the other side?

Q. Yes. A. There are only two companies that I know that are Canadian canners who have canneries on the other side. One is the B.C. Packers and the other is the A. B. C. Packing Company, and I do not think I have ever known of a case where either of those two companies have ever taken any fish out of British Columbia and canned them in Puget Sound

By Mr. Neill:

Q. How about the New England Fish Company?—A. The New England Fish Company have only got a cannery in Vancouver.

Q. No connections in Seattle?—A. They have connections at Seattle, but for fresh fish only—not a cannery. However, this argument is put up, that that increases the price of the fish. We will take the case of sockeye; there is an embargo on sockeye salmon into the United States. You can go back for a period for as long as I have been in the fishing industry—that is fifteen years; I do not know whether the embargo has been on all that time or not; I am not quite sure of that. However, ever since the embargo has been on, anyhow, they have paid a higher price on the Fraser River for sockeye salmon than on the Puget Sound—that is, Puget Sound canners—so that probably answers the argument about the price of fish. There is all the competition that is required in British Columbia amongst the canners themselves to fix the price of fish, and that price will be the highest that it is possible to pay, without this unfair competition that we get from the United States. As far as our company is concerned, we are quite willing to take any fair competition, but we consider this competition that comes in from the other side, which takes some of the fish from fishermen to whom we have supplied houses and other facilities, is unfair. I do not think from an economical point of view that it is in the interests of the country to have an unfair condition like that. We have an industry which is a pretty large industry, the salmon industry, and if there is not an embargo put on raw salmon I believe what will happen is that those canners in Alaska and Puget Sound will be able to keep their plants going by the amount of fish that they get from their own waters plus the amount of fish that they get from our waters, and that you will find in a number of years that there will be no salmon industry in British Columbia. That is the way I think it will work out.

Q. Would you mind explaining about this agreement in the Fraser river? You say it was an agreement by which the fishermen gave you so many and the United States gives you so many?—A. It is not an agreement; we are not in that agreement. We supply those fishermen, they live in our houses.

[Mr. F. Millerd.]

Q. You are talking about the Fraser river now?—A. Yes.

Q. Not the west coast?—A. Not the west coast, but this more or less applies to the west coast, except a few details. We supply them; they live in our houses, on our premises.

Q. Now, does that apply to the west coast?—A. No; that does not apply altogether but there is 25 per cent of the fishermen on the west coast—I think at least 25 per cent of our fishermen—have houses at our plants or live on the plant—not all the time; they are out fishing some of the time. Our plant as you know, Mr. Neill, is the San Mateo.

Q. How are the housing conditions apart from the houses for Japs?—A. We have houses for Indians.

Q. Houses for white people?—A. We have houses for white people. They are divided off into sections—I just forget how many—I think each house is divided into two.

Q. Well, to get back to the Fraser river—A. The Fraser river, we furnish these houses to the fishermen; at least, they live in these houses.

By Mr. McQuarrie:

Q. How many houses have you got?—A. On the Fraser river?

Q. Yes?—A. Well, I don't know; probably seventy.

Q. Where are they?—A. Some at the Vancouver Cannery, some at the Star Cannery, and some at the Burrard.

Q. Where are those situated?—A. The Burrard Cannery and the Star Cannery are on the main arm of the Fraser river, and the Vancouver Cannery is on the Sea Island.

Q. You have seventy houses occupied by white fishermen?—A. No; those are principally occupied by Japanese.

Q. How many are occupied by white fishermen?—A. Not very many; possibly four or five.

Mr. NEILL: Let us get on about this agreement; I did not get it right.

The WITNESS: They go out, and there is no actual agreement to it. We give them those facilities and in return they are supposed to deliver their fish to us at whatever the current price is, whatever price is being paid; but what actually happens is that in the Fall they deliver us about fifty per cent of the fish and they deliver about fifty per cent to those American buyers.

Q. You are not a party to that agreement?—A. We are not a party to it. As far as the embargo is concerned, I do not know that there is anything more that I could say. I had some figures worked out for one year showing the loss to the province; possibly I need not bother going into that just now; I will leave that for the time being. The next question on the coast that is possibly engaging a lot of attention is the Japanese question, and while I really am not advocating any policy one way or the other, I am simply suggesting something that might be done which would help the industry. The fact is that those fishermen have come in here, we have naturalized them, they are here, we have to do something with them, and we have to do it fairly and justly, which our British spirit calls for. However, if they continue to come in, there is no doubt it will be a very serious problem.

By Mr. Neill:

Q. What is the suggestion that you were going to make?—A. The suggestion I am just making for what it is worth; it is a very difficult problem, but I would suggest something along this line: there are so many Japanese fishermen in the Province, and they might be reduced say 5 per cent, or whatever percentage is thought advisable, for a period of five years, and then see how the thing works out.

[Mr. F. Millerd.]

By the Chairman:

Q. 5 per cent each year or 5 per cent in five years?—A. 5 per cent each year for five years, or it might be even made $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent or 10 per cent. That would give us in the industry a chance to work in white fishermen. There is nobody more anxious than I to see a white British Columbia. I have five children who will presently be citizens of this big country of ours, and I certainly do not want to leave the country after I pass out of it in such a state that my children would have a hard time making a living.

By Mr. Neill:

Q. Which you anticipate if things go on, and no relief is extended?—A. There is no question that the restriction on the immigration of Orientals will eventually come, but as I said previously, they are here and we want to do what is right by the ones that are here—I think that is generally felt—and in doing that, eliminating a certain percentage every year, they will probably work into other industries, or they will probably go out of the country, but they will not dominate any one industry.

By the Chairman:

Q. How would you proceed to reduce that by 5 per cent each year? What is your idea of doing it? What is your idea of how to do it?—A. I would do it something along this line. They are necessary at the present moment as far as canneries are concerned. We could not get along without Japanese for fishermen in British Columbia. The business would absolutely stop. There are so many licenses and I would attach those licenses to the different canneries that exist on the coast and make a stipulation that each cannery would fish 10 per cent less Japanese every year, for five years or whatever the percentage would be for five years, and at the end of five years it would be possible to see how this thing is working. We may not be able to get sufficient white fishermen and on the other hand we might. We have some white fishermen.

Q. What proportion of your fishermen now are Japanese and white in round figures at the present time?—A. Japanese 50 per cent.

Q. What percentage would be white and Indians?—A. I would say ten per cent.

Q. Ten per cent white and Indians?—A. Ten per cent white.

Q. That would be ten per cent white, forty per cent Indian and the rest Japanese?—A. Yes. That is a very rough estimate. I could submit the actual figures.

By Mr. Stewart (Humboldt):

Q. What races do the white fishermen come from. Are they Scandinavians?—A. Scandinavians, Scotchmen, Italians, Spaniards.

By Mr. Neill:

Q. Americans?—A. Very few Americans. As far as the salmon industry is concerned, there are few American fishermen.

By the Chairman:

Q. Very few Canadians there?—A. Very few Canadians.

By Mr. Spencer (Battle River):

Q. Are there any of these Japanese naturalized?—A. They are all naturalized.

Q. They are all naturalized?—A. Yes, they cannot fish unless they are. They cannot hold a license. I think a man can work as a boat puller on the boat. In order to hold a license he has got to be naturalized.

By Mr. McQuarrie:

Q. How many men to a boat?—A. On Rivers Inlet one man; on Skeena river, two men generally; on seine net fishing six to eight men; on the Fraser river generally one man.

[Mr. F. Millerd.]

By Mr. Neill:

Q. That is gill nets?—A. Yes.

Q. I thought there were two men to a boat?—A. On the Fraser river.

By Mr. Spencer (Battle River):

Q. Yes?—A. Very few with two men.

Q. Do you ever have mixed crews of white and Japanese?—A. No. I don't know of any case where we have had any mixed crew.

By Mr. Neill:

Q. On the same seine boats?—A. There may have been. I would not say. I don't think our company has ever had whites and Japanese. In fact on our seines we use altogether Indians and white men.

Q. How many seine licenses have you on the west coast of Vancouver Island? How many seine licenses have you on the west coast of Vancouver?—A. I think we had two for herrings last year and two for salmon. However, these fishermen are usually attached to the canneries, as they exist.

Q. Is that Japanese?—A. Yes.

Q. And only Japanese?—A. Yes.

Q. Why not limit the number of licenses issued to Japanese from year to year. Why go into the system of having them tied up to a cannery?—A. For this reason, the canneries have to have a certain amount of labour to get fish to start out with. If we decreased every year ten per cent and we introduced white fishermen, that is about the limit of what it is possibly feasible to do, and ten per cent may be a little strained as far as the industry is concerned, and that would be the simpler way, to attach them to the cannery, and each one would have to look out for independent fishermen.

By Mr. McQuarrie:

Q. Have you got canneries in District No. 2 of Fraser river?—A. Yes.

Q. What is your arrangement as far as independent fishermen are concerned? Do you buy fish from the independent fishermen?—A. We buy fish from anybody, as far as the buying of fish is concerned. There are very few independent fishermen on the Skeena river.

Q. What rates do you buy at?—A. If we supply the gear and the boat supplies, bluestone and the other things that go with it, we deduct one-third.

Q. And if you don't supply anything you pay the full figure?—A. The full figure.

Q. I notice there has been a good deal of complaint about that, that the independent fishermen say that the cannery men in District No. 2 won't take their fish, or if they do they will deduct one-third of the price.—A. I have never seen a cannery man yet that would not take fish. I know our company will any time when we get fish. That is what we are in the business for, to get fish and can it, and if it is independent fishermen we are not going to deduct one-third for the gear that we did not supply.

Q. Do you know about the other canneries?—A. I think that is pretty universal.

By Mr. Neill:

Q. I would like to go back to the point which you made about this embargo business. Last year were there a great many fish? I am dealing now with the west coast and I would like to confine it to that. Were there a large number of fish shipped to the American side last year from the west coast of Vancouver Island?—A. Not so much, for the reason that there was very little demand for fish anywhere last year. There were 800,000 cases of canned fish on the British Columbia coast this

[Mr. F. Millerd.]

time last year, and the only reason that probably most of us operated at all was to keep our organization going and because we know there was a loss staring us in the face.

Q. There was not much fish sent from Vancouver Island last year?—A. No, sir, I won't say that; not so much as other years.

Q. Is not the trouble in the cannery industry in the west coast and in B.C. due to the fact that they over build themselves, that the real trouble is there are too many canneries. As Mr. Bell Irving said the other day there were too many canneries?—A. There may be a certain amount of truth in that argument, but they are there never the less.

Q. Here is another point: you said—I don't know if you are as positive—perhaps you would like a chance to revise your statement. You said the American buyers did not buy from the local canneries. We have had two certified statements here that they do buy salmon and that they pay more than the local cannery can afford to pay.—A. We have always on the Fraser River competed against the American buyer.

Q. I am talking about the west coast.—A. Of course it is more or less a new thing on the west coast. This year on the west coast I think that the price has been the same as far as the actual fish is concerned, but what did happen was this, that these buyers would come over from the United States and they would bring their gasoline and pump it out of their tanks and supply the fishermen at a less price than we could give it to them at.

Q. That is smuggling?—A. It may be illegal but I believe it was done any how; not only that, but I think they have gone as far as to bring over engines.

Q. That is illegal also?—A. It is illegal.

Q. The way to check smuggling is not to put an embargo on fish but to check smuggling—

By Hon. Mr. Stevens:

Q. Where they transfer this gasoline outside the three-mile limit then it would not be smuggling?—A. They fish twenty or thirty miles outside. Goodness knows where they transfer. They have been transferring gasoline right along, these boats are fitted up in such a shape—

By Mr. McQuarrie:

Q. If you stopped that, it would solve your difficulty?—A. No, the difficulty is still there, that they take away a certain percentage of our fish.

Q. Why should they get the fish if you pay the same prices? If you pay as good prices as the Americans pay why should they get your fish?—A. Well, they will get our fish. Just the same as if there were fifty canneries on Barclay Sound they would all get a proportion of the fish. There is that unfair competition.

By the Chairman:

Q. About what percentage do they get?—A. One year they practically took the whole—that was before we went down there—they practically took all the salmon that was caught down there. At that particular time the situation was a little different. They had a market down in the Southern States for chum salmon which we did not have. Since that time we have developed a market in France for chum salmon.

By Mr. Neill:

Q. Those men live quite a distance away. They have to take their ice over to the American side and they have to haul the fish back again and they are subject to licenses and other expenses. Why are they able to compete with you? Why is it unfair competition?—A. If I had a cannery on Puget Sound and pack there ten thousand cases, my overhead is \$20,000 a year. That overhead per case is \$2. If I can come over to British Columbia and pack another 10,000 cases my overhead is \$1 a case.

[Mr. F. Millerd.]

Q. Where is the unfairness to you?—A. That is unfair to us.

Q. What is the advantage? They have got to come a hundred miles and they have to haul their fish, whatever the distance is. What advantage have they got then over you that makes you say it is unfair?—A. One advantage is a dollar a case.

Q. What do you mean by a dollar a case?—A. I say if I had a cannery on Puget Sound and we fished there for 10,000 cases, my overhead is \$20,000 a year. That overhead per case is \$2. If I can come over to British Columbia and get fish for another 10,000 cases, then my overhead is a dollar a case.

Q. Where does that fact make it unfair for you?—A. By taking 10,000 cases of raw material away from us we are in the position, as far as we are concerned that we have raw material for 20,000 cases but they take 10,000 cases away and we have only raw material for 10,000 cases, so instead of our overhead being one dollar, it would be two dollars.

Q. There is too much competition. Is it not a fact that on some occasions last year or the year before the fishermen could get their fish sold on the west coast and they had to sell to the American buyers. You people were not putting up a certain brand of fish that year?—A. What year was that?

Q. I think it was 1920 or 1921.—A. In 1920 we canned all the fish we could get. In 1921 we canned enough to keep our organization going.

Q. These independent fishermen went over to the American side to get these buyers?—A. One or two may have gone over but there was no more demand in Puget Sound than in British Columbia.

Q. Are you familiar with the Wallace Fishery Cannery?—A. I know where it is,

Q. Do you remember them selling a lot of fish caught by the American buyers on one occasion?—A. They are supposed to have done it.

Q. Practically they were willing to sell their fish when it suited them in defiance of the situation which you say would be remedied by an embargo?—A. There was some argument then. This will apply to some years it was done because they had a big market in the Southern States for chum salmon which we did not have. But now we have developed a market in France, Australia and Singapore and we can take all the chum salmon that British Columbia provides.

By Mr. McQuarrie:

Q. Coming to the Fraser river you would have the embargo apply there as well, I suppose?—A. Yes.

Q. Do the same conditions apply there as to gasoline being brought over from the American side?—A. Probably not to such an extent, but they certainly bring over tobacco and a lot of other things, I believe.

Q. There is quite an amount of smuggling goes on in that district but it is not so noticeable?—A. Yes.

Q. So for that reason it does not apply in the same way as on the west coast?—A. There is one thing about the Fraser river, and I will say this, that the fish that is shipped out of the Fraser river and exported, I would say 90 per cent if not all of it, is caught by Japanese. There is very little fish caught by white fishermen that is exported.

Q. You say the price won't be any higher if you allow the Americans to come in?—A. With the competition on the Fraser river, competition amongst the cannerys of the Fraser river will keep the price up.

Q. The price to the fishermen will be just as high if this embargo is put on?—A. Just as high. Take sockeye, for demonstration, we have paid higher prices.

Q. Why is it the fishermen object to the embargo being put on?—A. Really the situation has never been explained to them to show them properly just what the coun-

[Mr. F. Millerd.]

try is losing by it. I have spoken to some of the fishermen on the Fraser river, the white fishermen and they understand the situation thoroughly.

Q. I don't think you can find any white fishermen on the Fraser river who are in favour of this embargo being put on?—A. I will find some of them.

Q. I will challenge you to name any of them.—A. I think if this Commission goes out to the coast it will find some fishermen.

Q. Would you give me some names?—A. I am not going to give any names.

Q. I challenge you to do so. I am asking you to give some names.

Mr. MARTELL: I don't think that is fair.—A. I am not going to single out any fishermen.

Q. You refused to give me any names. I want to know would not this be a fact, that if there was an embargo against the export of raw salmon, British Columbia canners could get together and they could fix whatever price they liked?—A. They have been on the coast for 40 years and I have been connected with it for about fifteen years and if you can show me any get-together spirit in the canneries there may be some hope for it.

Q. The fact remains they could get together and fix the price and the fishermen would have to take that price—A. They could get together on sockeye but they don't.

Q. They don't?—A. No. They don't on anything else either.

Q. To be fair, I want to know whether there is an agreement as far as sockeye is concerned that cannery men will pay just as high prices as would be paid by the Americans.—A. I don't know whether there is an agreement. There was a statement made once that they were paying as high but they have paid higher and higher every year.

Q. Now the statement I make is this, that the fishermen are afraid that if this embargo is put on the export of raw salmon that the canners will get together and keep the prices down and that the fishermen will be suffering to that extent.—A. Some fishermen that have not taken the proper trouble to inquire into the economic condition—that would appear on first sight to be quite reasonable, to any reasonable fishermen, and I have talked to quite a few and I have explained the condition to them just to get their viewpoint on it.

Q. When Mr. Bell-Irving was here the other day he was frank enough and truthful enough to admit that the prices would be higher to the fishermen if this embargo was not put on?—A. Then do you mean to say I am lying?

The CHAIRMAN: Oh, no, no.

By Mr. McQuarrie:

Q. He stated that the prices would be higher. I do not think you are frank with the Committee?—A. I have stated my case.

By the Chairman:

Q. Can you tell us why the price of sockeye is as high or higher than it is on the American side?—A. Why the price of sockeye is as high on this side?

Q. Yes, or higher?—A. We pay a higher price.

Q. Why?—A. Because there is more competition. Most of the sockeye on the Puget Sound is caught by traps, and most of the fish is caught by traps. They have a way of catching fish over there—

Hon. Mr. STEVENS: Which we will not allow in British Columbia, Mr. Chairman. We will not allow trap fishing. That has been a source of complaint on the part of the canners for many years.

Q. Would not one of the reasons that the sockeye is not on the same basis as the chums be that you have an unlimited market for sockeye salmon?—A. And now for chums. There was a time when the United States had the Southern States eating

[Mr. F. Millerd.]

chums and we had no market, but we now have France, for instance. To emphasize that, I will say I do not think there are twenty cases of chums on the British Columbia coast to-day. We have the market, but if the raw fish is still permitted to go out they will get the market and they will have the salmon industry, and we will have empty plants.

By Mr. McQuarrie:

Q. Dealing with sockeye salmon, did the other canners and yourself take all the sockeye that was offered to you by the independent fishermen during this last season?—A. I cannot speak for all the other canners, but I say we did.

Q. You did?—A. Yes. Fish is what we want.

By Mr. Neill:

Q. I would like your opinion as a fishing man as to the effect in a general way, not in any one locality, upon the permanent industry of the continuance of using seine nets? Is it not a case of killing the goose that lays the golden egg?—A. Yes. I personally am in favour of seine fishing in certain areas, and would say that as far as the fishing industry is concerned it would not hinder our operations in any way to stipulate that only white and Indian fishermen be employed on seines.

Q. My question referred to the effect on the industry of continuing to use seine nets?—A. There is the purse seine and the drag seine. With the drag seine you can pick up every fish that comes up the river. A purse seine is cast from a big boat of 40 or 50 tons, and because of the size of it you cannot get close in. If drag seines were allowed promiscuously and without regulation the effect would be to clean every fish out.

Q. You are against drag seines entirely?—A. Yes.

Q. What about purse seines?—A. They are all right. You cannot take all the fish that comes into any bay with a purse seine.

Q. You can take all the fish inside the net?—A. Yes; but there are flats running out from every creek, where the purse seine cannot be used. Then there is a close season for twelve hours every day when these fish go up, but even if there was no close season, I would say emphatically that it would be impossible to absolutely kill the fisheries by using only purse seines.

Q. How do you account for the rapidly decreasing number of fish taken from year to year?—A. That applies to sockeye, but not, in my opinion, to the other grades.

Q. Are not the catches smaller?—A. Yes, but not because there is less fish.

Q. Are you not asking for an embargo to protect you against small catches with the consequent high overhead?—A. As far as the cheap fish are concerned, with the present policy and the present close season, I think if it is carried out and rigidly enforced it will probably work out all right. With regard to the question of an embargo, our point is that they take the fish away from us; we do not get a chance to can them.

Q. And consequently you have a small catch?—A. Yes.

Q. I thought it was generally admitted that the salmon industry was getting smaller in British Columbia?—A. Sockeye salmon, yes. I do not think chum and pink salmon are getting smaller. If there is no embargo or restriction placed upon the export of fish there will be intense fishing, and that leads to illegal fishing.

By Mr. McQuarrie:

Q. Why will there be more fishing? You say you will take all the fish that can be caught?—A. We have a certain amount of interest in the welfare of the country. It is not just for the few dollars I can make that I am here. Possibly I could make enough to retire and take things easy, but my interest goes further than that.

Q. If you took all the fish they could catch, how would that tend to decrease the number of fish that will be caught?—A. They come over from the United States without any regard for the interests of British Columbia. They do not care at all if in ten years' time there is no British Columbia.

Q. If you will take all the fish, what harm can be done? Your statement seems inconsistent. You say you will take all the fish the fishermen could catch?—A. Yes.

Q. And now you say if the embargo is not put on there will be more fishing than there would be if the embargo was put on?—A. Yes; because the American packer that comes over here has no interest in British Columbia and does not care how long the fisheries last. He will have his plant even if the fisheries play out, and will still have some fish for it.

By Mr. Martell:

Q. How would the price to the fishermen compare if there was an embargo with if there was not an embargo?—A. That has been demonstrated in connection with sockeye. We have paid a higher price for sockeye than is paid on the other side.

Q. Do not you think that the fact that the smacks come in and buy the fish and take it away has a tendency to make you people pay more?—A. I do not think so. There are lots of canneries there to keep the price up.

Q. Are not prices regulated by the law of supply and demand? It is a peculiar industry if that is not so?—A. There is a sufficient demand in the British Columbia canneries to take care of it.

Q. Then when they can take care of it, and when they know they are making money by taking care of it, if the Americans do come in will not that have a tendency to let the fishermen get a higher price?—A. It may have that tendency, but I cannot tell you what might happen; I am only giving you the case of the sockeye.

Q. But as a reasonable man, will you not say that if the Americans do come in to our market, that will have a tendency to cause you people to pay bigger prices? Is not that at the bottom of your opposition?—A. It may have that tendency, but I still maintain that there will be as big a price paid for the chum salmon and the pink salmon, because of the competition amongst the British Columbia canners, as there would be otherwise. You must not take the case of when they had the southern market for chums and we had no market for chums; the conditions to-day are different. As far as local conditions are concerned we will compete with the other packers and the price will go to the limit anyhow.

Q. Give us a real direct reason for your taking this out of the general law of supply and demand.—A. I have stated the reason to you. We have the market for the fish, and the competition amongst us will be intense enough to make the price just as high.

Q. Supposing the embargo was on and the only way of getting the price was competition among the local packers, would there not be a desire or a tendency among those packers to restrict the price?—A. I answered that a little while ago. In my experience—and I have been engaged in the fishing business for fifteen years—I have never seen a get-together spirit among the canners.

Q. You must act peculiarly out there. For years we were troubled with the lobster question on the Atlantic coast. You have a Canners' Association out there. Are you in it?—A. No, not actively.

Q. Are you not in it?—A. We are members of it.

By the Chairman:

Q. Do they discuss prices or fix prices?—A. In the Skeena river?

Q. I mean are they discussed by the association or by the individual canner?—A. The prices are made by the individual canners, not by a majority vote.

By Hon. Mr. Stevens:

Q. There is a question of fact outside of these questions that ought to be placed before the Committee and which influences me very largely in the consideration of [Mr. F. Millerd.]

this problem. The question of fact is this—perhaps I may put it in the form of a question. Up to a year or so ago—that is after the conclusion of the war—there was no market for British Columbia chum salmon, or a very limited market. Is that true?—A. A limited market.

Q. The market was limited?—A. Limited.

Q. And at the conclusion of the war there was an immense surplus of chum salmon?—A. That is correct.

Q. And it took some time to dispose of that immense surplus?—A. Yes.

Q. And in disposing of the immense surplus British Columbia canners found a market for chum salmon. Is that true?—A. That is correct.

Q. Now we come to this point, and I think this is the point that the canners desire to make: They have now created a market, after a severe loss, I may say, because they had to sell at much less than it cost to produce—as a matter of fact, several canners went broke—out of that emergency of difficulty this market was created, and now that they have a market for all the chum salmon that they can produce their desire is to conserve the supply of raw chum salmon for this market. Whether an embargo should be put on or not, these are the facts, are they not?—A. That is correct; to conserve the market, and in addition to that, if we allow the Alaska packer and the Puget Sound packer to come in and take our chums and pack them in their canneries, they could do so at a lesser price, and we lose our market and in the course of a few years there will be no salmon cannery in British Columbia.

By Mr. Neill:

Q. Last year you did not buy all the salmon you could have got?—A. Only last year.

Q. You restricted your pack?—A. Yes, to keep our organization going.

Q. That is the answer to Mr. Stevens. Last year you did not take all the independent fishermen's catch?—A. But this market was blocked up last year and all the fish it was possible to take was not taken in Puget Sound or in any other part of the world.

Q. But for the American buyers, the independent fishermen would have been starving or out of work last year?—A. I do not think they would.

By Mr. Martell:

Q. Do you not think that a fisherman should be permitted to sell his catch wherever he likes?—A. Provided it is manufactured in this country.

Q. What would you say if some firms in England wanted to buy all your salmon, and some American offered to give you a dollar more a case, should you not be permitted to sell to the American?—A. I did not catch that question.

Q. Supposing that certain firms in England could handle all your product but by selling to an American firm you could receive a dollar more a case, do you not think you should be permitted to sell to the United States, and would you not sell there?—A. Yes.

Q. Then why should not the same law apply to the fishermen?—A. Because as I have stated they would not get a higher price.

Q. The more competition, the better the price.—A. What about the sockeye? We have paid a higher price for it than they have paid. I have given you the situation as it is and as it will be.

Mr. McQUARRIE: There is a fisherman's side to the sockeye question also.

By Mr. Clark:

Q. Are there any artificial or natural barriers that keep our British Columbia packers from sending packers to the Puget Sound in their own waters?—A. The biggest proportion of their catch is caught in traps.

[Mr. F. Millerd.]

By the Chairman:

Q. In the cannery traps?—A. Yes. they have their own traps to catch their fish. In our case it is the gill-net; but there it is practically all done by traps.

Q. Is there no market for independent fishermen there at all?—A. There are a few gill-net fishermen.

Q. You have access to that market if you like?—A. By paying a cent a pound duty coming in.

By the Chairman:

Q. Can you send smacks over to the American side and buy salmon from American fishermen?—A. Yes, by paying a cent a pound duty.

By Mr. Clark:

Q. Do we pay a cent a pound on sockeye?—A. On all fish.

By Mr. Ward:

Q. What license fee does the Canadian packer pay?—A. He pays a license fee to the Dominion Government. I forget the exact figure; I think it is \$500.

By Mr. Neill:

Q. The Canadian fisherman pays a dollar a year?—A. I think they have introduced that system.

By Mr. Ward:

Q. It seems to me that this question is not being discussed in an unbiased manner, nor have the questions been altogether unbiased. I think we all agree that we should get some revenue from the fish that is taken from Canadian waters and shipped to the United States. I see no reason why we should not get a revenue from those fish by imposing a tax upon the fish themselves, and let the Canadian packer pay that tax upon the fish, and let the American do the same.—A. Then we are in the same position. That is where we started.

Mr. CLARK: Let us put the Canadian packer exactly in the same position as the American.

Mr. MARTELL: That is the whole idea of protection.

Mr. WARD: I am a free trader; do not forget it; but if our Canadian canner has to pay a \$500 license fee and the American buyer or packer can come in and buy our fish at exactly the same price—we will suppose the price is exactly the same—and take it on American soil and pack that fish without leaving anything in return except the mere price he paid for the fish, it seems to me that our Government is being robbed right there. I do not see any reason why there should not be a system devised whereby the American packer and the Canadian packer would pay the same percentage on the fish that he takes into his cannery.

Mr. MARTELL: Would you want to tax every farmer for every bushel of wheat that is sent to United States?

Hon. Mr. STEVENS: My friend here has put his finger on the main reason for this agitation. Our British Columbia cannery employ Canadian citizens who indirectly pay taxes to the country. The canner himself pays a heavy tax, and I think this ought to be clearly set before the Committee. He pays his canner's tax, his tax per case, and a tax on the fish. All these taxes are paid now, and they make a very heavy tax. When it was put on I was fully in accord with it, though I think it is too heavy for conditions as they are now. The Canadian canner has that heavy tax to pay. In addition to that, all the supplies that go into the business of canning, and all the supplies consumed by those engaged in it, indirectly pay taxes. On the other hand, the fish to the extent that they are taken and shipped out

[Mr. F. Millerd.]

of the country benefit us absolutely nothing except the amount paid for the raw fish to the fisherman. There is the economic problem, and I think it is one that should have very careful study before we reject it. I appreciate the position of Mr. McQuarrie, however, in desiring to preserve—shall I say?—for the fisherman as much liberty as possible in the sale of his product. I think that Mr. Found, the Superintendent of Fisheries, and the Deputy Minister should be queried in regard to that to see if we could not devise some way of protection for the fishermen against a possible combine, because, so far as I see, that is the only difficulty we are facing.

The WITNESS: I may add to that—I have not the figures worked out here—but I believe that even if the American packer paid the fisherman 10 cents per fish higher than we would pay, the country would lose a lot of money.

By Mr. Martell:

Q. But the fishermen would have more money?—A. I am saying that provided the fisherman got 10 cents per fish more by the American coming in here, the country would be out of pocket, so far as Canada is concerned.

Q. You mean Canada as a whole?—A. Canada as a whole. Even if they paid a much higher price, even if it should be 10 cents per fish higher, so far as the fishing industry is concerned, Canada would be out of pocket.

Q. Would you answer me this question, please? What percentage of whites and what percentage of Japs are employed in the canneries, in fishing and so on for the canneries?—A. Well, I have not got those figures; I would not care to state; it would be too rough to be of any use.

Q. What about your own cannery?—A. I made a rough guess at the percentage of men employed fishing. Inside the cannery the figures would be different.

Q. Is the regulation still in force restricting the number of boats in a particular river?—A. Yes.

Q. There used to be a regulation about canneries, I think, that a certain number of licenses were allocated to each cannery?—A. Yes.

Q. Is that still in existence?—A. That is not in existence, but I advocated something along that line, to work out this Japanese situation—I don't advocate it, but I suggest that—

Q. I do not want to be factious in the matter; I am not so familiar with the British Columbia situation, but I know what occurred on the Nova Scotia shore in regard to lobster fishing.

Mr. MCQUARRIE: What did occur there?

Mr. MARTELL: What did occur was that they did their utmost to keep the Americans from coming in and buying our lobsters. The result was that the American smacks would lie outside the three-mile limit and pick them up. After a while it was unprofitable to them, and the lobster canneries formed a combine. The packers met together at the opening of the fishing season and fixed a price, and the fishermen had to take it or leave it, because there was nothing else for them to do.

The WITNESS: Is there a combine in the canneries in the lobster business now?

Mr. MARTELL: I do not know whether there is or not now. It is a very hard thing to put your finger right on the very spot, because if we could put our finger on the spot we could prosecute them for a conspiracy in restraint of trade, but at the present time those canners are very acute. When a lot of moneyed men get together it is hard for a lot of unorganized people to fight them.

The WITNESS: There is no organization of canners in our business, and there is not very much of an organization of fishermen; the fishermen do not organize. We get along very nicely, and the intelligent white fishermen, I think—and I think the majority of the fishermen on the British Columbia coast—if the situation is put up to them clearly, will vote for an embargo, as far as that is concerned; and I think

[Mr. F. Millerd.]

you will find, Mr. Chairman, that evidence from the white fishermen on the British Columbia coast will be something along that line. They all have their families, they are all interested in British Columbia, and they all have a patriotic spirit.

Mr. SPENCER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the witness a question in regard to Japanese labour.

By Mr. Spencer:

Q. You told us, I believe, that 50 per cent of your labour was Japanese at the present time?—A. That is, fishing; I said "about."

Q. You suggested trying to cut them down a certain percentage each year?—A. Yes.

Q. Now, suppose that you cannot get Indians or white people to take the place of the Japanese, is it the fact that you would like to keep the Japanese on?—A. The idea of cutting them down is to see how the thing works. I believe we can get a certain number of white fishermen. The question is whether or not we can ever get enough white fishermen on the British Columbia coast. Probably in time we can, but you can force the position so that people will have to get white fishermen to take the place of the fishermen who drop out. I would not make that a policy to follow until the thing is wiped out; I would say to let it go until it got down to 75 per cent or 50 per cent.

Q. But if you cannot get the white fishermen to work under the conditions that they have to, would you be in favour of keeping on the Jap labour?—A. If it was the case of the industry going out of business or keeping Japanese labour there to keep the industry going, then I would keep the Japanese there to keep the industry going; but I think you will find out that it will gradually work out that way.

Mr. MARTELL: For instance, under the Act relating to fishing, the regulation or prevention of fishing, the only way you could prevent, or the Federal authorities could prevent, the Japs from fishing, would be by making it so that no person could fish without a license, and that Japanese would be granted no licenses. On the other hand, as regards whom you could employ in your canneries, that should be a matter of local jurisdiction—property and civil rights—and the regulation as to working in factories could not be made by the Federal authorities.

The WITNESS: It is supplied now in the fishing; as far as the fishing is concerned they will only give so many Japanese licenses.

By Mr. Martell:

Q. Licenses to fish?—A. Licenses to fish.

Q. That is quite true; but not as regards the manufacturing of fish?—A. There are practically no Japanese employed in the canneries; they are only employed in the fishing.

Mr. MCQUARRIE: Mostly Chinamen.

The WITNESS: It is Chinamen and Indians that are employed.

Mr. MCQUARRIE: A great many Chinamen, at any rate.

The WITNESS: Not all; I do not know that there are 50 per cent Indians, and some whites.

By an Hon. Member:

Q. The buying of these salmon is confined largely, if not altogether, to canners; is that right? A man does not buy salmon to any extent unless he is a canner?—A. Not to any extent; there is some fresh fish buying.

Q. And the Canadian canner or buyer pays a license of \$500?—A. Yes.

Q. How would it be if the American buyer who comes into our waters were also asked for that \$500 license?—A. Well, you will always have the condition that I tell you about. He gets more fish than we cannot get a chance at; he brings down his

[Mr. F. Millerd.]

overhead and reduces a dollar a case, and when he reduces a dollar a case he puts ours up a dollar a case.

Q. The idea is that you would be more on a parity?—A. More on a parity, but not equal.

Mr. MARTELL: Supposing the American smacks lie outside the territorial waters, how are you going to control them? You cannot tax the American if he does not come inside the territorial waters. They did that in connection with lobster fishing in Nova Scotia.

The CHAIRMAN: The British Columbia cannerys have to pay a tax of \$500, and then so much a case on every case they manufacture or pack. One reason was given either by you or some other gentleman who gave evidence, that because you had to pay such a heavy tax both to the Federal Government and the Provincial Government, and the Americans had to pay no tax—that was the reason they could pay perhaps more for the salmon than the British Columbia packer could.

By the Chairman:

Q. How would it be if the Federal Government decided not to make you pay a license or not to make you pay a tax on your pack? Then you would be on the same basis as the American buyer?—A. Not unless the American laws were the same as our laws. If they are out of fish for a day they can come over and get some of our fish; they can pack twenty thousand cases against our ten.

Q. One of the reasons given by either you or somebody else—I just forget who it was—was that you had to pay this heavy tax of 4 cents a case, and also \$500 for a license, and the Americans came over and bought the fish free; they were in a better position, their overhead charge was less than yours, and consequently they would have to pay less for the fish. If you did not have to pay that tax, would you be in the same position as the American packer?—A. No, sir, because they would still have raw material for ten thousand cases on their side, and we would have raw material for twenty thousand cases here; they would come over and take ours and reduce their overhead; but we could not get any of theirs.

By Mr. Neill:

Q. You want a total prohibition?—A. It is an unfair condition.

Hon. Mr. STEVENS: Mr. Chairman, there is a point to which I would like to draw the attention of the Committee. On Puget Sound trap fishing is permitted extensively; in fact, I think it is one of the causes of the depletion of our Fraser river fisheries. We do not permit trap fishing in British Columbia—that is, this Government does not—except in one or two isolated cases. It is the practice of trap fishing and the securing of very cheap fish through that method that puts the American canner in an advantageous position as compared with that of the British Columbia canner. Canada has tried for several years to induce the Americans to abandon that system of fishing, which is perhaps the main cause of the depletion of Pacific coast fisheries. That is an unfair competition which our cannerys are forced to face.

By Mr. Neill:

Q. I would just like to ask a question, to bring out for this gentleman the answer to his question. The \$500 license is the license to operate a cannery, is it not?—A. Yes.

Q. And the actual license to buy fish in Canada is one dollar, is it not? I could go out right now and get a buyer's license for one dollar?—A. The seining license is \$300, and so on.

Q. And I presume the American cannery has some expenses?—A. Certain taxes.

[Mr. F. Millerd.]

Mr. HATFIELD: The only thing is that the buyer who buys to any extent is a canner.

Mr. NEILL: But he does not have to pay \$500; he only pays one dollar.

By Hon. Mr. Stevens:

Q. What provincial license tax do you pay?—A. \$100 cannery license, I think, and I think 4 cents a case; then there is income tax, or business profits' tax, as it was.

Mr. MARTELL: Mr. Chairman, have you on the record the proposed arrangement between Canada and the United States as regards salmon fishing in British Columbia? I mean, the proposed treaty which was never finally consummated?

Mr. McQUARRIE: That was to be filed, I think Mr. Found said he would file it.

Mr. MARTELL: If that agreement had gone into effect it would have saved a whole lot of this, would it not? That is, as regards the protection of our fisheries?

The WITNESS: As far as British Columbia is concerned—as far as the Fraser river is concerned, but they are coming not only from Puget Sound—they are coming in both directions; they are coming from Alaska.

By the Chairman:

Q. The Provincial Government, of course, knows the competition which you have with the American buyers. It is rather strange that they make you pay a provincial tax, knowing that you have this competition. Why do they make you pay that?—A. I suppose they want revenue, Mr. Chairman.

Q. And they do not care where they get it?—A. I do not know, but even then, Mr. Chairman, while these taxes are a factor, they are a comparatively small factor, when you consider the unfair condition that we are in. Here is your raw material that goes out of the country free, and if we want to ship canned salmon or any other manufactured salmon into that same territory there is a tax on it.

By Mr. Martell:

Q. Could you give us something as to the nature of the tax? Isn't the tax more or less a sort of provincial tax on the valuation of your property, or is it on every fish that you catch?—A. 4 cents per case.

Q. Well, is it not a question whether that is a legal tax or not?—A. Well, of course, as far as licenses and taxes are concerned, I think that there are too many different taxes and too many different ways. The way that I would work it is to take so much money for the Department, and I would put on license fees and get away from these little taxes here and little taxes there.

Q. Have you ever tested in the courts the constitutionality of that tax on the basis of so much per case?—A. Not since I have been in business.

An hon. MEMBER: How about coal?

Mr. MARTELL: Coal is vested in the provinces; in the western provinces we do not have the natural resources. Coal is not a matter of federal jurisdiction. In the case of the fisheries, control of fisheries is expressly given to the federal authorities under the British North America Act. Coal is vested in the provinces—apart from the western provinces.

By Hon. Mr. Stevens:

Q. As I understand it, you have a \$500 Dominion Cannery tax to the Dominion Government?—A. \$500 cannery tax?

Q. You pay \$500 to the Dominion?—A. I think that is correct.

Q. You pay \$150 to the Province for a cannery tax?—A. \$100 license.

[Mr. F. Millerd.]

Q. Then you pay 4 cents a case on sockeye to the Dominion?—A. Yes.

Q. And 4 cents a case to the Province?—A. Yes.

Q. That is 8 cents a case; and 3 cents a case on chums?—A. 3 cents to the Dominion and 4 cents to the Provincial on chums.

Q. That is a pretty heavy tax; and then in addition to that there are the seine licenses, \$300?—A. Mr. Stevens, with all the seining licenses and the fishing licenses in 1920—I would not be sure of the year; I think it was 1920—we packed somewhere between fifty and sixty thousand cases of salmon at that cannery, I think, and we paid over \$15,000 in taxes and licenses, without income tax or business profits' tax; that is one plant.

Q. One cannery paid \$15,000 in taxes, and you packed about fifty thousand cases?—A. Yes.

By the Chairman:

Q. Is that tax outside of your tax on real estate or personal property?—A. No, that was taking in all the taxes except the income tax.

By Hon. Mr. Stevens:

Q. That would be very slight because the canneries are out in isolated places?—A. The consumer pays that in the end if you can pass it along to him.

Q. The canner does not pay it?—A. He has paid all the taxes for the last couple of years.

By Mr. Stork:

Q. There is the saw-mill tax in connection with the stumpage fee.

By Mr. Neill:

Q. Is it not within your knowledge that all these taxes combined net the Dominion Government such a sum that they are enormously out of pocket in the protection and propagation of the fish?—A. I don't know about that. There is one thing that I would say, they protect the raw material here and I think the fishery industry here is fairly well able to take care of itself. As a matter of fact I would like to advocate just there that on the west coast of Vancouver Island the Dominion Government equip a steamer with a small laboratory and a little canning plant and put fishermen, good fishermen on there that are acquainted with fishing in probably different parts of the world and it is my opinion it would be one of the best investments or amongst the best investments any how, that the Dominion Government ever made. I think on the west coast of Vancouver Island there is more fish than we know anything about and with the development in the Orient, as they get educated along different lines—there are pilchards out there. In one case in one year we had what we believed were sardines. The next year we got the cans to can them and and we were in the same position. Probably some of you men know what looking for fish is out in the Pacific Ocean or any other ocean. It is like looking for a needle in a haystack. I think in the pilchard industry in the west coast of Vancouver Island, I think with the fish in the quantities we have there it will probably get to a stage where it will rival the canning of other varieties of salmon except sockeye. There is the herring. We are ourselves working now on shrimps, but that costs a lot of money. One individual cannot do it. We have done a lot of experimenting work and it has cost a lot of money.

By Mr. Martell:

Q. You mean the Government should have a scout boat to find out where they could locate them, a sort of experimental fish farm?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Bancroft:

Q. What effect would the embargo have on the conservation of the supply of salmon? Would it have any in your opinion?—A. It will have this, as I think I

[Mr. F. Millerd.]

explained before. These Americans coming on to the coast have absolutely no interest in Canada. Their interest is to come in there and get all the fish they can just as quickly as they can and how they can and they don't care whether there is a fishing ground in British Columbia in one year or ten years from now. They come in and bring in their own crews one way or another, probably British subjects living over in the United States whereas we are there, most of us have our children there and we are really interested in British Columbia to see that it goes ahead.

By Hon. Mr. Stevens:

Q. Do you argue the embargo will increase or deplete the supply of salmon?—
A. It will deplete it, because of the more intense fishing.

Q. By not having the embargo?—A. By not having the embargo.

Q. At previous meetings of this Committee we have been discussing negotiations with the United States for the preservation of salmon on the west coast. In the face of that if we put on an embargo against United States people coming in here to buy salmon, would not that have a certain effect against the completion of those treaties?—A. The treaty is just for the Fraser river.

Q. Would it not have a serious effect against it?—A. I don't think the treaty will have a serious effect as far as I can see. It looks to me that that treaty will never go into effect. I don't think we will ever have a treaty. As far as that treaty is concerned, I think the sooner we forget about it now the better.

By Mr. Martell:

Q. Don't you think it would be a good policy if you put this embargo on to revoke all the privileges that the United States vessels have on the Atlantic waters apart from what they have under the treaty?—A. I think we can put the embargo on raw salmon in British Columbia without causing any annoyance to the United States. I think it is so palpably wrong on the face of it they should not have any objection.

By Mr. Stork:

Q. Let me say a few words in connection with this fishery proposition. We have been discussing this embargo on fish and all our sittings of this Committee here have been centered on debating and investigating the cannery standpoint. This salmon fishing is really only one part of the fishing industry. Now we have built a railroad to the North Pacific fishing grounds, the Grand Trunk Pacific line which runs to Prince Rupert. Prior to the construction of the Grand Trunk Railway the fishing trade was centered in Alaska and Seattle. I am speaking of fish generally coming into Canada from the American side, which is penalized by one cent a pound duty; Canadian fish going into the American side is admitted there free. Last year in the port of Prince Rupert there were 26,465,500 pounds of halibut handled in the port of Prince Rupert which otherwise should have gone to Alaska, which would provide a tremendous tonnage for our National Railways. The Americans are objecting to this tremendously in Washington right now, endeavouring to put every possible obstruction in the way of marketing fish in Canada. Anything of this nature in the way of an embargo would be treated as a hostile act. We have to look after this fish business from a broad standpoint if we are going to show the Americans some act of hostility. My opinion is that Canada quits loser by half a million dollars a year in this fishing industry, that is that our revenue from the fishing business is half a million dollars less than our expenditure. We are pocketing that loss already. Can you give us those figures, Mr. Found?

MR. FOUND: I would have to speak subject to—

WITNESS: That is not the revenue the country derives from the fish. The country derives a tremendous revenue from the fisheries.

HON. MR. STEVENS: I think Mr. Found could tell us approximately the figures.

[Mr. F. Millerd.]

Mr. STORK: What I was going to say is that this country quits loser by the operation of the fish industry. Now if we go to work and show the Americans a hostile attitude by reason of this embargo and for the sake of helping out the cannery industry, we are going to endanger the whole of our fishing industry, including salmon and halibut and all the rest of it. We want to take this from a broad standpoint. I for one am absolutely opposed to sacrificing the whole of our fish proposition in Canada for the sake of helping out the canneries. The canners are here complaining of certain difficulties. I remember in British Columbia when the salmon choked the Fraser river. Salmon were legion; they were unlimited. Now they are gone. Well, the cannery people have had an absolute monopoly in regard to the handling of the fish business. If the fish are exterminated the cannery people cannot blame the lumbermen or any other industry for the termination of the fish. They have had the whole right to handle them and if the sockeye are gone the cannery people have contributed largely to that condition. The sockeye is almost an extinct specie. We are asked to step in and conserve the hump back and dog salmon. What market have we got? We have Americans in Washington now doing their utmost to interest the American Government in destroying the traffic over the Grand Trunk Pacific and also in the port of Prince Rupert of American fish and in a matter of this kind we should take into consideration every aspect of the case. I have the figures here which I will put into the record (reads):—

“DEPARTMENT OF MARINE AND FISHERIES
FISHERIES BRANCH,

OTTAWA, ONT., April 28, 1922.

Dear Mr. Stork,—The following will, I hope, give the information you are anxious to obtain:—

Cost.	1917-18	1918-19	1919-20	1920-21
Cost of Fisheries Adminis- tration in B.C.	\$263,609.18	\$215,156.10	\$457,911.65	\$533,642.13
Cost of Fisheries Protection Service	54,111.00	18,979.96	81,429.09	176,770.01
Total	\$317,720.18	\$234,136.06	\$539,340.74	\$710,412.14
Revenue	53,665.21	59,349.94	270,698.41	233,282.04

I am not including 1921-22 as the information is not yet complete. It will not differ far from 1920-21 so far as cost is concerned, but the revenue, which is complete, was only \$150,126.94.

Yours truly,

(Signed) WM. A. FOUND,
Assistant Deputy Minister of Fisheries.

FRED. STORK, ESQ., M.P.,
House of Commons,
Ottawa.”

Mr. McQUARRIE: I have a telegram from the President of the B. C. Fishermen's Protective Association, President J. Reid of the British Columbia Protective Association, in reference to the proposed embargo which reads as follows (reads):

New Westminster, B.C., April 29-30, 1922

W. G. McQuarrie, M.P.,
Ottawa, Ont.

At a meeting of the Association it was passed that if the Department passes an embargo on raw salmon going to the American side we might as well stop fishing as there will be seven plants on the Fraser river this season with fifteen hundred boats fishing. Letter will follow.

J. REID.
[Mr. F. Millerd.]

I might say I also have some resolutions which were passed on the 15th of April by this same Association. Now I explained on a previous occasion that this Association was controlled by white fishermen in British Columbia. I think that probably it is the strongest Association that we have among the fishermen. Now it is rather difficult for the fishermen to present their views at this long range. I hope an opportunity will be afforded to them and to the other interests to appear before some Committee, perhaps a Sub-Committee out at the Pacific Coast so that the matter can be thoroughly covered and so that they will have an opportunity of presenting their views at first hand. It is very difficult, as I say, for them to inform me by letter or otherwise exactly how they feel on the various matters which are coming before this Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: What do you say to bringing the fishermen here to give evidence.

WITNESS: As far as the fishermen are concerned, they are not able to pay their way out here. It would be impossible even for the Association to pay the expenses of sending two or three of their representatives here.

Mr. MARTELL: You are up against the fact that they would probably not speak as freely. They would be more stage-struck here probably. In any case, the fishermen are not as used to giving evidence as cannery men are and they would probably do better on their own ground.

By Hon. Mr. Stevens:

Q. I was going to suggest that we get through with Mr. Millerd before we adjourn.

WITNESS: I would like to reply to Mr. Stork and perhaps ask Mr. McQuarrie some questions afterwards.

The CHAIRMAN: I may say that the representatives of the Press have a lunch with the Governor General and they would like us to adjourn at a quarter to one. They asked me to adjourn this meeting at a quarter to one. Suppose you leave this matter until another meeting. Is there anything particular you want to say before we adjourn?—A. I was going to ask about that resolution of the British Columbia Protective Association, and I was going to ask how many members the B. C. Protective Association had, because we had a resolution sent down here from an Association that was not in existence.

The CHAIRMAN: We can get it.

Mr. MCQUARRIE: I don't think Mr. Millerd suggests this Association is not in existence. As a matter of fact the Department has recognized this Association for some years as Mr. Found will tell you. This has been recognized by the Department and on all occasions when changes in regulations have been contemplated the authorities did consult with the representatives of that Association.

WITNESS: Mr. Stork spoke about the halibut industry. As far as the halibut industry is concerned the United States people will ship halibut from Prince Rupert as long as it suits them and I don't think that the question of antagonizing them in any shape or form is a very great matter. Now he has also mentioned about the revenue, what the country lost and so on. I think that his remarks apply only to the difference between the revenue as collected by licenses and the expenditure.

The CHAIRMAN: I might say the revenue last year was about \$120,000 in British Columbia in round figures.

Mr. MARTELL: That was the direct benefit, not the indirect benefit.

The CHAIRMAN: The expenses are very much heavier than the receipts. It is ten minutes to one. I think we will adjourn.

The Committee adjourned at the call of the Chair.

COMMITTEE ROOM 425,
HOUSE OF COMMONS,
THURSDAY, June 15, 1922.

The Select Standing Committee on Marine and Fisheries met at 11 o'clock, a.m., the Chairman, Mr. Duff, presiding.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I might continue with the resolutions I started to read at the last sitting, resolutions passed by the British Columbia Fishermen's Protective Association, at a meeting held on April 15, 1922 (reads):

"RESOLUTION No. 1

"That all salmon fishing in the Province of British Columbia shall start at 6 or 7 o'clock Monday morning and shall stop at 6 o'clock Saturday morning. By that we allow the salmon another 6 hours more time weekly to get up to the spawning grounds on the Fraser River. So that the Government should allow us to fish right through till the 20th November without any close season. For the rest of the province we have got to hang around the canneries for 48 hours. So why instead of fishing Sunday evening till Friday evening at 6 p.m., should it not be from 6 a.m. Monday to 6 a.m. Saturday, and why should we be the only class of white labour in the province that is compelled to work on Sunday when there is no necessity for it."

"RESOLUTION No. 2

"Now, sir, Mr. Ballantyne in 1919 opened up No. 2 District of this province so that white independent fishermen could go there and fish their own gear, but the cannerymen last year refused to buy the fish from any man owning his own gear."

I would like to call particular attention to this item of the resolution because at the last sitting Mr. Millerd stated that the cannerymen had not refused to buy salmon last year from the independent fishermen.

"They would only pay him the same price as fishing cannery gear. Whether it was done with the consent of the Department or not, I do not know. Now, sir, there is only one way to make the cannerymen comply with the law and that is to take the embargo off sockeye in No. 2 District until such time as they will buy the fish from the Independent Fishermen."

By Mr. Martell:

Q. The regulation is that no person shall export salmon except in salted pure state?—A. Something like that. I don't know the exact wording.

By Mr. Stork:

Q. Who is that Resolution from, Mr. McQuarrie?—A. The B.C. Fishermen's Protective Association.

"RESOLUTION No. 3

NASS RIVER DISTRICT.

"Inspector Motherwell has had interview with the Alaska Fishery Officers regarding regulations but latter will do nothing. The result is their traps and seines are catching Nass Sockeye. Canadian Officers have given notice of 48 hours' close season and expect Canadians to propagate fish for the Americans.

[Mr. F. Millerd.]

The Nass is identical with the Fraser. The Americans get at the fish first with their traps and seines. The only way to do is to have no close season at all on the Nass, as long as the Americans continue to slaughter the fish the way they do."

By Mr. Neill:

Q. There are no traps on the Nass?—A. He knows what he is talking about. It says the Americans on their side of the line are catching the Nass Sockeye.

Q. How did the Nass sockeye get down to the American shores?—A. The Nass is identical with the Fraser, he says here. The Americans get at the fish first with their traps and seines.

"RESOLUTION No. 4

"Sir, we strongly object to three different licenses in this province, as you are aware, sir, the moment we move from one district to another we have got to pay another ten dollars; that's what the law says. I found by calling up the Chief Inspector Major Motherwell that they have got District No. 2 alone divided into 7 or 8 different zones so if a man moves about 20 miles to fish he has got to pay another 10 dollars. If they keep on that way, they might as well turn it over to the cannery man and his seines the way they used to have it previous to 1919. When they had the ocean divided into zones between them and notices up 'No White Man Need Apply' until they compelled the boys after they came back from France to burn their seines for them, and they were afraid to prosecute because the public would find out how they had the greatest monopoly of our fisheries the world has ever seen."

"RESOLUTION No. 5

"As you are aware, Sir, our men have been trying right along for the use of our gas boats all over the province but the department says no that we can not use them in District No. 2 because the cannery men do not want them. We can't use our small 3½ horse-power to drift with, but he can use his large 50 or 100 horse-power linge to seine with. Now, sir, if we can't use ours, if we do any harm to the fish what is he doing with his big 30 or 40-ton boats? For the last two years they have been holding a farcical election to see whether we wanted gasoline or not, of course under Williams and staff it was a foregone conclusion that we would get defeated. Now, sir, we demand this year every white man that takes out a license in District No. 2 to record whether he is in favour of gas boats or not and that all inspectors be compelled to see that he does so before he gets his license instead of the cannery clerks going to them with the names, and granting at the rate of twenty or thirty at a time whether the applicant is a British subject or not."

By the Chairman:

Q. It reads like a letter?—A. He has headed them "Resolutions," and he put them in that way.

"RESOLUTION No. 6

"I see you took up the Board Question. We want to keep at them for the fisheries of British Columbia will never be run properly until we get it, for it don't matter what laws you pass, the moment Parliament rises then the Order in Council business starts and the Fisheries Department does as they please and all for the worst. But what can you expect? For the last 30 years there has never been a man appointed to the Fishery Department that

[Mr. F. Millerd.]

knows anything whatever about fishing. The old political system of appointees was bad enough but the Civil Service in B.C. is worse. They appoint men that just landed in this province. Now if they need returned soldiers, the Fishermen's Union for its size has more returned men members than any organization in Canada. I see that Mr. McNeill of Alberni, Comox, says that the inspector of his district told him that anyone could get a license to operate a hand cannery but our experience is entirely different. What we want is take the license off the canneries altogether and put on a pack license. The way they have got it a plant can put up 500 cases or 5,000 per day and they pay the same license. Is that right?"

Now I will put these in. Then I received a communication from one of the cannery men, quite a prominent man, Mr. Henry Doyle. I would like to read that letter.

By Mr. Martell:

Q. Is he in favour of the canners or in favour of the fisheries?—A. He is a cannery man himself.

Q. Is he a part of the alleged combine they have up there? It is alleged to be a combine?—A. He is in the Northern B.C. Fisheries, Limited. I see they have canneries at Bella Coola, Mill Bay, Port Edward, Kumeon, Kimsquit, Namu, Port Essington.

Q. Is he a member of the so-called British Columbia Canners' Association?

The CHAIRMAN: They all are. He is one of the cannery men.

Mr. MARTELL: That is the alleged combine.

The WITNESS: I will read part of this letter (reads): "What I have advocated as the only proper means of administering our fisheries is by the creation of a local fishery board—on somewhat the same lines as the Washington State Fish Board—that would be composed of practical fishermen and canners and into whose hands would be placed just as full administrative powers as the Vancouver Harbour Board possesses. This would leave the methods to be employed, the cost of administration, and all other details, to the decision of men possessing local knowledge and uninfluenced by political considerations either federal or provincial. Such a board should be above and independent of the present Dominion Fisheries office. It should be a sort of court of arbitration to act between the recommendations of the latter and the desires of the fishing interests. The members of the Board should be paid adequate salaries (as are the members of the Harbour Board) so they could devote all their time and energies to the fishing problems. If so appointed, and their active participation in fishing operations *ipso facto* cease, there is no more reason to question the fairness and impartiality of their actions and decisions than would be the case in regard to any member of the bar that is elevated to the bench.

"As to the objection raised that local control is not feasible owing to the magnitude of the expenditure involved, there is no merit in this contention. Everyone knows that the administration has been grossly extravagant; that many things are charged up against fishery operations that should not be so charged; and that if sane business administration is employed the savings effected would probably bring the expenditure within the limits of the present income. If it would not however, no one in the industry would object to still further taxation, provided funds so obtained were applied to restoring the fisheries instead of being frittered away as they are at present.

"Our local papers contain a despatch from Ottawa stating that Mr. Found's testimony before the Standing Committee on Marine and Fisheries was that it was 'an international crime,' that nothing had been accomplished at the recent conference between the Washington State Fish Board and the Federal representatives. The

[Mr. F. Millerd.]

enclosed newspaper clippings show whom the public here blame for this 'crime.' There have been many attempts made to have the United States Federal Government given control of migratory fishes, but all such attempts failed for the simple reason that United States legal authorities hold such federal control would be a violation of State rights, and therefore unenforceable. To persist in fighting for an international treaty under the circumstances is foolishness. The real 'crime' consists in following this will-o'-the-wisp and refusing the adequate help which the Washington State Fish Board has the authority to give. The parties responsible for the failure of the late conference were the Dominion of Canada representatives, and the excuse they gave for breaking up the conference was childish in the extreme.

Yours very truly,

HENRY DOYLE."

He sent me these editorials. I don't know whether you want me to read them or not.

By Mr. Martell:

Q. Have you read them?—A. Yes.

Q. Are they reflecting upon any officials of the Department? If so I don't think they should go in. It is not fair that newspapers outside who are not accountable may attack them?—A. Here is an editorial of the Vancouver Sun of Friday, December 16th.

Mr. MARTELL: Mr. McQuarrie can pass that editorial in if we deem it should go in evidence, but I don't think the stenographer should take notes of it. I submit for your consideration Mr. McQuarrie might read his editorials to the Committee and then if they are not in any way deemed derogatory to the officials they might go in, but to have the stenographer take them at the present time when they are unsworn statements and reflect upon people who have given evidence, is not quite legal procedure.

WITNESS: I don't think there is anything in these editorials that is an attack at all.

The CHAIRMAN: Read them. Don't take them down, Mr. Stenographer. (Reads)—A. Is there anything objectionable in that?

Mr. MARTELL: I say when he makes the assertions and says it was political jobbery and trickery, it should not be permitted to go in. That is a statement made by a newspaper and it reflects seriously upon the officials and it is not given under oath and if permitted to go in you are going to circulate a newspaper editorial reflecting upon officials of the department who have no opportunity of defending themselves. They are nasty veiled insinuations and I don't think they should go on the record and that newspaper should be compelled to say to this Committee wherein the trickery and the political jobbery lies. That is my suggestion. It is unfair. Men come here like Mr. Found or others, who have had probably something to do with that investigation or the International Conference and give evidence and then if newspapers out in British Columbia or I don't care where they are, are going to be allowed to reflect on men's honesty by veiled insinuations, I don't think this Committee should be a party to circulating these veiled insinuations and nasty charges. Therefore we should consider these newspaper matters outside the scope of this investigation or we should not consider them at all. If they are going to do that they can make all kinds of reflections, not only upon officials, but also upon members of Parliament, and I think when they make veiled insinuations, these things should be ignored. If they will come up and make direct charges, these should be made and investigated by the proper authorities, and not make this Committee the medium for sending out insinuations and I object to it going in.

The CHAIRMAN: I don't think it is very important, is it?

[Mr. F. Millerd.]

WITNESS: I am putting them in because I say they were sent to me by this canner man and he asked them to be submitted to the Committee. I submit them and if you rule them out of order, very well. I have one here from the Vancouver Province.

By Mr. Martell:

Q. Every person who is accused should have a right to cross-examine his accuser. I was formerly connected with the Fishery Department and know the officials are conscientious and do their duty?—A. These newspapers are commenting on certain conditions and I presume they have a perfect right to do that and I have no doubt it was not the intention of the newspapers to have these editorials used before this Committee at all. They were not, I suppose inserted for that purpose, but they are here and they do certainly contain criticisms of the actions of our representatives in connection with this conference and they point out certain things they think should be done.

Q. They set themselves up as an extra judicial body outside of this House even, in commenting on something they know absolutely nothing about, undoubtedly actuated by malice, and I claim they should not be considered?—A. I don't know that there is any malice about it. The situation is a very serious one, an extremely serious one.

Mr. MARTELL: Mr. McQuarrie is not asserting it as his own reasons, but these people reflect upon evidence given by Mr. Found before this Committee. These people outside write articles which reflect seriously, almost charge the officials of the Department with trickery and political jobbery. They don't know what took place at the International Conference and they set themselves up to judge upon evidence they have not seen. If we are going to consider them, these people should be compelled to come before the Committee or the Committee should go to them and compel them to substantiate these insinuations and charges which they make and give the officials concerned an opportunity of cross-examining them. I think it is a most unfair thing to permit people to be abused for any matter or to have insinuating charges of corruption levelled against them without giving them an opportunity of being heard.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the officials of the Department are well able to defend themselves, and then again we must not forget that these editorials have been circulated all over British Columbia and consequently the people of British Columbia now are under the impression that people have been doing something they should not do. Whether it is worth while putting them in this record or not, I don't know, but I agree that something should be done to ask these men to substantiate these statements and to make a direct charge. It is not fair to the officials who have been giving attention to these matters and attending these conferences that they should be charged with trickery.

Mr. MARTELL: I was in the Department for four years and I don't think there is an official who would be consciously guilty of anything crooked.

The CHAIRMAN: We have not decided to put them in yet.

Mr. MARTELL: Don't let the stenographer take them.

The CHAIRMAN: He is not taking them. I told him not to.

WITNESS: I don't see any reason why they should not go in. Mr. Found can come afterwards and show wherein they are wrong.

The CHAIRMAN: If the editors of the papers were here we could cross-examine them, but the trouble is all we have is what they say in their newspapers and we have no chance of asking them for any further information.

WITNESS: There is no charge of corruption or anything of that kind against any of the officials referred to in any of these editorials.

[Mr. F. Millerd.]

Mr. MARTELL: Of what value are they?

The CHAIRMAN: He can read them first and see what value they have.

WITNESS: Here is one, Friday, December 16, 1921.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that an editorial?

Mr. FOUND: The editorial was a very favourable comment.

WITNESS: It looks like a newspaper item.

The CHAIRMAN: It is a news item.

Mr. FOUND: That is merely a news item.

WITNESS: There is another one in the *Sun*, December 18, 1921, under the heading of "Salmon Extermination".

The CHAIRMAN: This is an editorial.

WITNESS: Yes, this is an editorial "Salmon Extermination." I will hand these into the Chairman, if the Chairman thinks they are alright.

By Mr. Martell:

Q. Supposing you were making an argument one way or another in connection with those matters, surely to goodness in the summing up of your argument, you would have to argue as a lawyer from the evidence, and you would not be permitted to argue from those editorials, because they are not sworn testimony. This is a court at present. You cannot come to a conclusion on unsworn testimony?—A. We have not had one witness sworn yet.

The CHAIRMAN: It seems to me the more information we get, whether it is sworn testimony or otherwise—

Mr. MARTELL: If you will pardon me one minute, no court of law will permit sworn testimony to be contradicted or the opinion or judgment of the court to be guided by that which is not sworn testimony and non-evidence, so to speak, given outside which is not sworn to before the court adjudicating. That is my point here now. It seems to me at the outset one of the editorials Mr. McQuarrie has read dealt with the International Commission, which was presided over by Sir Douglas Hazen, the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and now Chief Justice of the Province of New Brunswick. It was an international commission which considered the facts. There were American representatives as well as Canadian representatives. They came to certain conclusions; they proposed a sort of draft arrangement which was never ratified by the United States authorities. That never having come into effect, this editorial comes in and charges that commission with political jobbery.

WITNESS: Trickery.

Mr. MARTELL: Trickery. Which there is no evidence to show. I submit these people should not be castigated by a newspaper appearing in any province in Canada. These editorials, which are not sworn to and which make veiled insinuations should not be permitted to go in evidence and to be circulated by this Committee or taken into consideration by this Committee in arriving at a conclusion. It would be a most outrageous proceeding. I submit, for any court of justice, to take the opinion of any newspaper outside as regards a matter which is subjudice.

The CHAIRMAN: I have not decided whether I will allow them in or not, but my only reason for allowing them in would be to give Mr. Found or any other official a chance to refute them.

Hon. Mr. STEVENS: We are not trying the International Fisheries Commission and therefore Mr. Martell is arguing a little aside from the point. If we were going to pass some judgment on them I would say his point was well taken and if the International Fisheries Commission's report is called in question by any authority or supposed authority I think that Commission is sufficiently broad in its scope of

[Mr. F. Millerd.]

activity to take it under advisement, although they may not accept it as a definite charge against them. I think we should not confine ourselves to the strict code of rules and I rather agree with your inclination at the moment to allow us to hear those.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I think it is a splendid opportunity to be given to the officials to refute something that is scattered all over the country, because it puts them in a bad position and they have an opportunity of putting something on record which will refute it.

Mr. MARTELL: If the officials are going to be compelled time after time to answer all sorts of insinuations or all sorts of charges which are made by irresponsible parties outside who are dissatisfied with something that has taken place, and these charges are not made under oath, even though you ask them to refute them, I think it is something that is not permitted in any court of justice.

The CHAIRMAN: Do you think it is wise to allow an assertion of that kind to go unchallenged?

Mr. MARTELL: I think these editorials should be read by way of side issue, so to speak, but then we won't take them into consideration in arriving at our conclusions in regard to this particular matter, but we would say to the House and to the officials that we deem these insinuations of sufficiently serious import that we should compel these people to substantiate them under oath and then give the officials of the Department an opportunity of cross-examining those people who make the charges, but Mr. Stevens misunderstood me. His idea was I was objecting to hearing the editorials. I am not objecting to hearing the editorials read, but I submit they should not be taken into consideration in arriving at our conclusions. We might offer observations on them and see if they are of sufficient import to be investigated.

WITNESS: My idea is this: we have a situation which is very serious. We find it has been impossible for the authorities of the Dominion Government and the authorities of the American Government to come together on this very important matter. There is some cause for that. Millions of dollars of loss per year is being suffered. If this is allowed to go on in a comparatively short time the sockeye salmon will be extinct. I say we must not be too thin-skinned about a matter of this kind. I want to say now that as far as I am concerned I make no charges against Mr. Found at all. I have the greatest confidence in Mr. Found, as I said in many occasions in the House and elsewhere. Mr. Found is doing good conscientious work and has been doing it. I am not attacking him at all, but something is wrong some place. Now it may be that we are getting a wrong aspect. We are taking the wrong course in connection with this matter and I say there are some people who think so. Now the matter is serious enough to cause editorials to be published in the newspapers in British Columbia and they are the ones most vitally interested in this question. I say these editorials should be placed before the Committee. I bring them before the Committee without any idea of attacking the officials at all and I submit them to you and I say now it will be easy for Mr. Found or for the others to stand up here and answer any charges that may be contained in those editorials if they desire to do so.

By Mr. Martell:

Q. Would you have that go in evidence, the answer?—A. Yes, have it go in evidence.

Q. You are going to compel a man to answer under oath simply an insinuation, a statement that is not sworn to?—A. Mr. Martell is too technical altogether. This carrying on of an investigation at long range is very difficult. How in the world can witnesses under oath be produced down here in Ottawa on all those questions. A few cannerymen have come here and have given evidence but they could afford to do it. There are a lot of people who cannot afford to do it.

[Mr. F. Millerd.]

Mr. NEILL: Have you any objection to this editorial going in, Mr. Found?

Mr. FOUND: I have no objection to those editorials going in. There was only one editorial read. I would like to say, if the editorials are going in, I would like that the editorials published in British Columbia go in but not the news items, which might be written by people who are not in the responsible position of editors.

Mr. NEILL: Which do you think would hurt Mr. Found's and the other gentleman's reputation most, the introduction of these or the reports that were going throughout Canada and that were not suppressed?

Mr. FOUND: Mr. McQuarrie, who is submitting these, was in Vancouver. He knows the situation on the Fraser river extremely well. He knows the feelings of the Fraser River Association; he knows the feelings of the Cannery Association there, their general opinion and he knows the situation from his own standpoint. Is he expressing his views when he read that editorial from the Sun?

WITNESS: I don't suggest that at all. I read to you a letter I had and it was suggested these editorials be put in and I did not suggest those were my own views at all.

Mr. FOUND: I did not put that quite as I would like to. Would Mr. McQuarrie have any objection to giving his own view?

WITNESS: I intend to make a statement later covering the situation.

Mr. FOUND: That is as far as these negotiations are concerned?

Mr. MCQUARRIE: I would be very glad to do that. If you would like these other items, I will do so. If you don't, I will stop.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON, Deputy Minister: The only observation I would like to make on behalf of the Department is this: I don't want, either within or without the Committee, the idea to obtain for one single moment that the Department is objecting to the introduction of any testimony in this record. If there are any complaints to be made in respect of the manner in which any particular business of the Department is executed I have not the slightest objection in the world to the introduction of any part of this. I think it is better for all concerned. Whether it is better for all concerned or not, I think it is better for the benefit of the Department. I am more or less in the position of Li Hung Chang, who considered himself a very fortunate man when he made a mistake if somebody called his attention to it, and the Department would consider itself fortunate if attention was called to any mistake. It would be of some value to the Department to have some evidence from people who are in a position to speak for the industry of the course adopted at the Conference at Vancouver, whether it was in the general public interest. It will be of very great interest to the Department I might say to be advised either now or subsequently. Whether Mr. McQuarrie's own view with respect to the Fraser River fisheries co-incides with the view that we should take into account on condition that obtain 5 years hence. If his view is that we should enter into negotiations to-day and conclude arrangements regardless of the manner these should be conducted 5 years hence, it will be of some interest to the Department. No doubt we will have either now or at some later stage an expressed opinion from Mr. McQuarrie as to whether his views are in accordance with the views of the newspapers reporters, not the newspapers, because I think that if you take the opinions of the newspaper by and large, it will be found, if I mistake not, that the preponderance of the opinion of British Columbia, that is, insofar as it has found editorial expression is rather favourable to the course that has been pursued. That does not mean, of course that the position is a proper one, or that we should not alter the position we have taken up to-day. I would suggest, Mr. Martell, as far as we are concerned that we are not thin-skinned. We are sufficiently old in the Department not to be thin-skinned about it. We are going to expect criticisms, and I may say frankly unless the criticisms come, it will be worse for us than for anybody, and if there are any legitimate criticisms to come, let them come, I am bound to concur,

[Mr. F. Millerd]

I think, with the view expressed by Mr. Martell that this Committee should not be the means of circularizing or broadcasting criticisms unless these criticisms are supported before the Committee by evidence. That is my view, so far as I am in a position to represent the view of the Department. I would invite all and sundry to make all the criticisms that come to their minds.

Mr. STORK: My objection to this particular item which Mr. McQuarrie read is simply this, that I look upon it the same as an anonymous letter. You will notice it starts off "a prominent cannery man" I forget just the wording. It gets behind the statement that some cannery man has stated these views. It is the same as an anonymous letter would be. I would like to get any information as long as there is something concrete that takes a definite stand. I don't think the Committee should take any notice whatever of what we might term anonymous communications, and that is one of them. That is my view in regard to that particular item.

WITNESS: If we could make some arrangement whereby persons interested in fishery could give their evidence at the Pacific Coast, it seems to me we would get a lot of information. I would suggest we should hear not only from the cannery men but also from the fishermen and from the business interests. If there is any way in which an arrangement could be made for holding sittings out there I think it would be advisable to do so. I know as far as the fishermen are concerned, they think this inquiry is a little bit far removed from them and that they are not getting every opportunity to present their views, their grievances, their complaints and their suggestions to this Committee. How that could be done of course, is a matter that would have to be discussed. I don't suggest that all the Committee could go out there to British Columbia. I don't suppose it would be convenient for them to do so.

Mr. CHISHOLM: A nice trip.

WITNESS: It would be a nice trip. If they could do that, of course I would be very glad indeed, and I have no doubt all the British Columbia members would be very glad indeed and the people out there too, but in default of that being feasible, possibly arrangements could be made whereby a sub-committee could be appointed to take evidence at the Pacific Coast. As to the time when the trip could be made, of course I would defer to the judgment of Mr. Johnston and Mr. Found to a great extent. Of course they would know when it would suit the fishing interests better than I do. But if we could have a sub-committee go out there and hold sittings in the different important centres of the fishing districts I am sure it would do a lot of good. Now that we have this Committee working I think we should make the investigation as full and complete as possible. I have nothing to conceal: I have nothing to present here for the purpose of discrediting anybody. That is not my intention at all. My intention is if possible to get some action taken which is going to remedy the very unfortunate situation which we have in British Columbia to-day and more particularly in the fishing districts. I throw out that suggestion. If a hearing was held in British Columbia, we could tear up these newspaper editorials and that kind of thing. We could tear up the letters. We could ask the witnesses to appear before the Committee and give their evidence in the usual way, but in default of that being done I suggest our hands must not be tied and this Committee should take any evidence which bears on this matter, whether it would be in the form of letters or news items, or whether it would be editorials or whether it may be as you would take and put them on your files and give them what weight you think they are entitled to.

The CHAIRMAN: Since Mr. McQuarrie put his Resolution on the order paper, I may say I have received from British Columbia a great many letters with regard to the serious state of the fisheries out there. I have read them all. I have not placed them before the Committee as I thought they were too many and we would not be able to deal with them. As Mr. McQuarrie says, and I quite agree with him, the situation is serious and this Committee should endeavour to get a settlement which would be satisfactory to the fisheries and to the business men who are interested

[Mr. F. Millerd]

in the fisheries. How that could be done I could not say, but I have thought it would be pretty hard for this Committee at this distance to get evidence here from British Columbia I fear, and even after that evidence were taken I fear this Committee would not be in position as to what report to make to the Government or to the Fisheries Department. Whether Mr. McQuarrie's scheme is feasible to appoint a sub-committee to go to British Columbia and investigate I don't know. I would like to have the opinion of the Committee. I do feel the position is so serious that this Committee should not decide the situation by editorials or by newspapers that any of the members received. I think the matter is so serious that this Committee should arrive at some solution whereby we could get a full investigation whereby the matter could be settled for five years or altogether. Everybody is complaining and there is no definite action we can take. Mr. McQuarrie says if we can have further evidence, either by the fishermen or the people interested, he would not put those editorials in. I would like the opinion of the Committee as to which way we should proceed.

Mr. DICKIE: I think Mr. McQuarrie suggested the only solution, which is to have a sub-committee go out and make strict inquiries into all the grievances which exist. There is no doubt many of the fishermen are not able to send their representatives here. We want to do what is fair to everybody and I think it would be fully justifiable on the part of this Committee, that a sub-committee proceed to British Columbia to inquire into the conditions. I don't see any other way that we can get at it effectively. Many of us from British Columbia dislike to see some editorials put on our record because you can put any construction you like on some editorials. I think the only feasible way is to go to British Columbia.

Mr. NEILL: I would like to put a couple of short letters on the record if you will allow me. They are from fishermen. I don't know them at all. They are not sworn to. These fishermen cannot come here personally and give evidence. As regards the point that they are not sworn to, I don't think that need worry us very much when we consider some gentlemen who came here and were sworn and after a most superficial examination admitted that some statements they made previously were not the case. I just want to read those two short letters as evidence of the situation in British Columbia. They are of value in that regard, although their personal grievances may or may not be correct. This is from a man named John Macdonald. (Reads):

"C o Post, Office,
Irvine's Landing,
Pender Harbor, B.C.

May 20, 1922.

— Neil, Esq., M.P.,
Houses of Parliament,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—I wish to call your attention to the fact that I am being discriminated against in favour of the Japanese, in applying for a net at the Strathcona Cannery, Wadhams, Rivers Inlet, this year. I fished for them last year, and I have fished for 15 years at Rivers Inlet.

Last year I was refused a net from the B.C. Packers at Rivers Inlet at the Brunswick Cannery, where last year they also took on 12 Japanese extra; this was after I had fished for the company for about 20 years, and no reason was given me whatsoever.

I am going up to Rivers Inlet in a few days, and I hope that you can see your way clear to take action in the matter.

[Mr. F. Millerd]

I am enclosing a copy of the letter I received from the Strathcona Cannery, Wadhams, Rivers Inlet, and I am also writing a similar letter to Major Motherwell, Chief Fishery Inspector, Vancouver.

Thanking you in anticipation, I am,

Yours faithfully,

"John MacDonald."

P.S. There were several white independent fishermen who wanted to fish their own nets last year, but the canneries would not take their fish."

As regards his kick that he was refused work, of course nothing can be done by this Committee as is shown by the following letter: (Reads):

"Wallace Fisheries, Limited, Vancouver, B.C.

Strathcona Cannery,

Wadhams, B.C.,

13th May, 1922.

Mr. John MacDonald, Pender Harbour, B.C.,

DEAR SIR,—In reply to your letter of the 10th May, I am sorry that I cannot put you on my list of fishermen for this season, but all my gear was promised before your letter reached me.

Yours truly,

STRATHCONA CANNERY,

(Signed) A. E. FORRER, Manager."

Here is another letter from Mr. Humphreys. (Reads):

"May 23, 1922,

Bamfield P.O., Barclay, Sd., B.C.

A. W. Neill, Esq., Ottawa,

Re Embargo on Export of Fresh Fish.

SIR,—As a fisherman on Barclay Sound, I notice with interest and much consternation the big drive being made by the packing interests to press the above embargo. The fishermen here of all creeds and colours are 100 per cent absolutely opposed to it.

I'll say more, if the embargo is enforced it will mean the ruination of the trolling industry on the west coast. We practically all are trollers and as independent fishermen we want a fair field and no favours for the sale of our product.

You probably know something about the spring salmon trolling and what a large industry it is getting to be, and what a large amount of money it brings to the west coast and is put into circulation there by the independent fishermen engaged in it.

We fish for spring salmon almost exclusively and we maintain that the B.C. Cannery have made no serious effort to secure our fish and that if it hadn't been for the initiative of the American buyers the trolling industry would still be where it was ten years ago.

Last year we had much trouble disposing of our fish. No. 1 red springs dropped as low as five cents a pound at one time and yet Goose Millerd and Wallaces wouldn't touch them even at that price.

The result was when fish was most plentiful the boats had to be in harbour waiting for a Seattle buyer to show up.

This year the fishermen got together and formed the Port Alberni Fishermen Society to place our fish in a fresh state on the Seattle market and through

[Mr. F. Millerd]

this and the efforts of Seattle buyers placing more carriers at our disposal we are now sure of a steady market at a fair price for all our catch. The prices at present are as follows:—

(over 17 lbs.) No. 1 red springs, 12c. lb. dressed.
 (under 17 lbs.) No. 2 red springs, 9c. lb. dressed
 White springs, 3c. lb. round

The spring salmon, as you doubtless know, is not very desirable for canning purposes and commands a much higher price on the fresh fish market. So the No. 1's are mild cured and the smaller No. 2 sold fresh or frozen in Seattle.

Now this is where the B.C. packers fall down if all the springs were large No. 1's suitable for mild curing they could easily afford to pay us a price to compete with foreign buyers.

But unfortunately a large percentage was under that weight and for the disposal of these the Canadian Cannerns had developed no market, they could can them but being worth a great deal more as fresh fish and the market for fresh fish in Canada remaining undeveloped, the natural place for them to go to is Seattle where they are retailed for as much as 35c a lb.

Now we fishermen maintain that if the embargo takes place this organization which has been created for the disposal of our product will be wrecked and nothing left to it but to either tie up our boats or be at the tender mercies of the B.C. packers if they ever eventually did manage to absorb all the spring salmon which is caught here.

Here is an instance typical probably of what would happen all round but this is what is happening to-day. The Wallace Fisheries are buying springs here *indirectly*, "they have leased their mild curing plant to a Jap, Jap buyers on the float here and a Jap crew taking the fish to Kildonan cannery. These same Japs will refuse to buy a white fisherman's catch and yet indirectly employed by Wallaces. Can you wonder that we feel great uneasiness at being handed over hand and foot to the Can. Packers. It is surprising no fisherman was called on to give evidence before the Fisheries Committee, but we are behind Mr. McQuarrie in the fight. He is working for us and we should like your assistance also on the question.

We are grateful of the stand you are taking on curtailing Jap. licenses, and this has encouraged many white fishermen to invest money in boats. There are, like myself, many returned men engaged in fishing and we do not wish to be unpatriotic or narrow minded on this embargo question, but we feel and do feel strongly that our living is at stake and many of us will be forced out of the fishing and thrown to the labour market and our place taken by the friends of the B.C. Packers, namely, the Orientals.

Now, Sir, I hope this letter will be one nail in the embargo's coffin and you will help to drive it home.

I remain,

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) R. H. HUMPHREYS."

Hon. Mr. STEVENS: Who is that from?

Mr. NEILL: R. H. Humphreys. I don't know him from a bale of hay. There is a very flourishing business down there on that class of troll salmon.

The CHAIRMAN: I am afraid we cannot have many more meetings of this Committee this session. What do you say as to what we should do to get further evidence?

WITNESS: I think the idea of the Committee going to B.C. would be very nice indeed, if you could get unpaid members of Parliament to go out and do it. Otherwise you fall back on official commissions. We have had official commissions time and again.

[Mr. F. Millerd]

The CHAIRMAN: In other words, there is no provision for paid members of Parliament?

WITNESS: No.

Hon. Mr. STEVENS: There was one very exhaustive inquiry not covering all these points, but covering many points by Mr. Sanford Evans a few years ago and previous to that there were two other Royal Commissions which took most exhaustive evidence and gave close and intelligent study. I don't think I agree with their whole findings, but certainly there are facts which would be of inestimable value. The two main points now are this embargo upon the export of raw fresh fish and this depletion of the Fraser river, which is a most vital problem. That is involved in the international problem. I personally would hesitate very much to offer any criticism of the International Committee that sat. I think their findings should be carefully read and if they did not seem to meet the case, we simply have to make efforts to bridge any troubles that are left unsolved and light can be thrown on that by a sub-committee—I think not a very large sub-committee—going to British Columbia and on the ground taking further cognizance, or evidence if you like, of proposals not covered in the previous reports. I think it would be a mistake to traverse all the ground covered by the Sanford Evans and other Commissions into many many details of the fishing problem, because I think you would be very much involved in a study that is almost interminable. The department I am sure have this information and it would summarize the conclusions readily for us, but those problems I mentioned are unquestionably very important.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Who is promoting the idea of the embargo?

The CHAIRMAN: The canners. The canners want an embargo on all fish.

Hon. Mr. STEVENS: The application for an embargo is before the Committee.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Is it the canners or the fishermen who are promoting the idea?

Mr. NEILL: The canners, absolutely.

Hon. Mr. STEVENS: My mind is wholly open on that question. I think there is a good deal to be said in support of the canners' view, but on the other hand, such letters as were read by Mr. Neill merit consideration, but on the other hand also, speaking of the statements made in that letter, I would like to hear what the canners have to say as to their alleged actions. Mr. Neill says he does not know the man from a bale of hay. It is hardly wise to jump to any conclusion that all the conclusions in that letter are absolutely true. It is proper to receive it and proper to hear it, but at the same time, is not he to have some opportunity of replying? I merely wish to summarize what I say in this, that it would be very valuable indeed, if you yourself, as Chairman of the Committee, with one or two perhaps from Eastern Canada who are familiar with the fishery question, who knowing our local conditions, could visit the coast this summer and hold either an informal or a formal sitting of the Committee. As far as we are concerned, we would welcome it most heartily and lend any co-operation we could.

Mr. CHISHOLM: You would treat the Committee who would go out there well?

Hon. Mr. STEVENS: Reasonably.

The CHAIRMAN: My only worry is, I don't see how we are going to arrive at any decision sitting in Ottawa on that question. If anybody can tell me how it is to be done I would be glad to know it.

Mr. MARTELL: Could not the Committee get its expenses by going to Parliament?

The CHAIRMAN: The whole question is as somebody suggested, members of Parliament could not be paid for this investigation. Personally I would not mind

[Mr. F. Millerd]

myself going, just for the satisfaction of getting in touch with the fishermen out there.

Hon. Mr. STEVENS: A member of Parliament is not permitted to accept out of some general vote compensation, but if a vote were put in to cover the expenses of a sub-committee, I think that could be done.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I don't think there is anything to prevent the payment of your expenses, of expenses incurred by members of the House of Commons. I don't think there is.

Mr. NEILL: If that is going to be contemplated, I would like it very definitely defined as to whether they will take evidence of all classes of the fishing industry?

Mr. CHISHOLM: Absolutely.

Mr. NEILL: In the past, our experience has been this, they landed in Vancouver and they were immediately surrounded by a body of cannery fishermen. A few selected whitewashed fishermen got control of the Committee out there, and in the main it was a cannerymen's investigation. It might as well have been put in an envelope and sent down here. I say take evidence and hear it from the fishermen as well as the cannerymen. Take it at every fish plant possible.

WITNESS: We have one statement made by Mr. Neill. I say as far as the Sanford Evans Commission was concerned, that Commission certainly did not give the fishermen in my district a fair chance to present their case. I took exception to it at the time. As a matter of fact, the white fishermen had retained me. I was not then a member of Parliament. I was retained to present their case before the Commission and when I appeared there for that purpose, Mr. Evans said I could not be heard. He said he did not propose to hear counsel at all, either for the cannerymen or the fishermen. That of course, from the cannerymen's standpoint was quite satisfactory, because the cannerymen, as I pointed out to Mr. Evans and the other Commissioners at the time, were quite capable of presenting their case in an intelligent form, but those fishermen were not familiar with the proceedings of Committee, and so forth, and they were rather at a disadvantage. Notwithstanding all those arguments that were produced, Sanford Evans refused absolutely to hear me and present this case. If they did the same thing in various parts of the province, I say the fishermen did not have a chance at all of being heard. I say this time, we could do better before a committee of Parliament, rather than a commission. These commissions do not seem to accomplish very much. We have had various commissions inquire into the fishing business of British Columbia, but nothing has come of it. I thought we might do better with a parliamentary committee. I don't see what form it takes, whether it is formal or informal, whether the witnesses have to be sworn or not, but I think if a sub-committee would go out there and get practical men, they would get a lot of information and be able to handle this matter intelligently next session.

The CHAIRMAN: It is quite evident the Committee cannot do very much more this session of Parliament. Will you decide whether we will recommend to Parliament a special Committee be appointed? We cannot get the fishermen here now for this session of Parliament. Consequently if we decide it is not feasible or advisable to send a sub-committee, we have to let the whole matter stand over until next session. Shall we report to Parliament it is advisable to send a sub-committee of this Committee to British Columbia to investigate the questions thoroughly on the ground?

Mr. DICKIE: I would move along the lines you have just suggested, that you suggest to Parliament that a sub-committee be sent to British Columbia to inquire into those conditions, with yourself as Chairman of that Committee.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I second that.

[Mr. F. Millard]

Hon. Mr. STEVENS: Would it not be advisable to include in that an expression, to this effect, that in view of the fact that there are a large number of witnesses the Committee desire to hear, that it would be felt it would be more economical, more to the interests of the Committee as a whole that a sub-committee should go because I think the expense of a sub-committee would be far less than bringing the witnesses down here, so that ought to be set out in your report.

Mr. DICKIE: Absolutely.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MARTELL: Would you name the number of the Committee?

Hon. Mr. STEVENS: You have to include that in your report.

The CHAIRMAN: How would it be to put in Mr. Dickie's motion that a sub-committee be named now to draft a report to Parliament along the lines suggested by Mr. Dickie, so that we could meet in a day or so and consider their report. You could meet in the course of a day or so and decide what number you think should go. We can decide now. There should be one or two men in British Columbia on that Committee.

WITNESS: We have five from British Columbia. We want some eastern men.

Mr. MARTELL: They would have contrary views, perhaps. What is the resolution now?

The CHAIRMAN: That a sub-committee of this Committee be appointed to draw up a report to the House, suggesting and recommending that a sub-committee of this Committee proceed to British Columbia and there investigate the fisheries, all matters pertaining to fisheries at British Columbia, in view of the complexity of the situation and in view of the fact that it is impossible to get witnesses here from British Columbia.

Mr. MARTELL: Would you name the sub-committee to draft the report?

Mr. DICKIE: I would suggest Mr. McQuarrie, for one.

The CHAIRMAN: Have you got time, Mr. Stevens?

Hon. Mr. STEVENS: No, I will be out of town.

The CHAIRMAN: I will name Mr. McQuarrie, Mr. Martell and Mr. Stork. When will you have that report ready?

Mr. STORK: I may be out of town for a day or so, but I suggest Mr. Neill take my place.

The CHAIRMAN: Have you got time, Mr. Neill?

Mr. NEILL: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Very good.

Mr. McQUARRIE: When can we have that?

The CHAIRMAN: I think we ought to have a meeting Monday for you to give us your report.

Mr. FOUND: If you will permit me I would like to read a telegram. I have no comments to make on the telegram, but the telegram was sent to me by Mr. Millerd who gave evidence here. It is written as "Miller" in the telegram, but it should be "Millerd." He says (reads):

"May 30, 1922,
HALIFAX, N.S.

"W. FOUND,
Asst. Deputy Minister of Fisheries,
Ottawa, Ont.

Bell Irving stated in his evidence that we are the firm referred to in page twenty-six Evans Report as having received license on condition white fisher-
[Mr. F. Millerd]

men only should be employed, this is incorrect stop. Think the firm referred to must be either Hasport Company or Canadian Fish and Cold Storage. Would you please correct when you complete your evidence."

"FRANCIS MILLER."

Mr. MARTELL: We have had certain discussions as regards editorials and Mr. McQuarrie read those, and I would like to move that all these editorials are arguments and that the editorials be struck out.

Motion agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: What about the evidence taken so far. Should that be printed?

Mr. MARTELL: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it worth while to print the evidence?

Mr. STORK: Not in view of the fact that we are holding the investigation.

Mr. FOUND: I am quoted as saying it was a crime that the Committee of last December did not reach a conclusion. This Committee will recollect that it was not what I said. What I said was "it would be an international crime if this matter were not settled in some proper way." The other point I would just like to refer to, is that after the meeting we held last December, the canners association held a meeting and asked me to come before them. I explained the whole situation to them, as I explained it to this Committee. Mr. Doyle was there. There was no resolution passed, and from the comments that were made at that meeting I felt I carried away with me the full endorsement of the association and I am very sorry this matter did not come up before those three witnesses, who have been here, who are members of the association, came along, that they would have given their impression on it at all events. I tried to get it in the last time. I simply wanted to make it clear. I have given my evidence and it will stand for itself.

Mr. MARTELL: I would move the evidence be reported for the information of the Committee.

Mr. MCQUARRIE: I don't think we are through with Mr. Found altogether. I presume at a subsequent series of sittings we will have Mr. Found.

The CHAIRMAN: If we go to the coast we will have him there. If not, we will have him here.

Mr. MCQUARRIE: We will have him the next session of the House. I understand this Committee will not make a report now to the House except that permission be given to the sub-committee to take evidence.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. MCQUARRIE: Next session of Parliament I presume this Committee will continue its work and if we don't have a chance to do so before then, I would like then to continue with the examination of Mr. Found, because I have a number of other matters which I would like to have him discuss and explain.

The CHAIRMAN: Certainly.

The Committee adjourned.





GretagMacbeth™ ColorChecker Color Rendition Chart

